

JPRS-UPA-88-032  
16 AUGUST 1988



FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE

# ***JPRS Report***

## **Soviet Union**

---

***Political Affairs***

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPBS-UPA-88-032

### CONTENTS

16 AUGUST 1988

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Estonian Creative Unions Radical Reform Proposals Published	<i>[MOLODEZH ESTONII, 13 May 88]</i>	1
Estonian 'Popular Front' Plans Criticized in Open Letters		3
Non-Estonian Interests Not Considered	<i>[A. Sashin; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 7 Jun 88]</i>	3
Conflicts With Constitution Noted	<i>[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 7 Jun 88]</i>	5
Founding Member Responds to Objections	<i>[M. Lauristin, M. Mets; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 26 Jun 88]</i>	7
Georgian CC Censures South Ossetian Officials for Reform-Lagging		
<i>[GRUZINFORM, ZARYA VOSTOKA, 28 April 88]</i>		8

#### HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Afanasyev Urges Separation of History, Ideology		
<i>[Yu. Afanasyev; LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, 17 Jun 88]</i>		12

#### RELIGION

State Moving Toward Normalization of Relations with Church	<i>[A. Ignatov; KOMMUNIST, 21 Jun 88]</i>	19
------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	----

#### CULTURE

Voznesenskiy Criticism of Khrushchev Challenged		21
Reader Defends Khrushchev	<i>[A. Kozyrev; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 9 Jun 88]</i>	21
Voznesenskiy Defends Criticism	<i>[A. Voznesenskiy; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 11 Jun 88]</i>	21
Authors New Rights To Publish At Own Expense Questioned		23
Benefits Seen As 'Fiction'	<i>[G. Gunn; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 4 Jun 88]</i>	23
Text of New Regulations	<i>[Unattributed report; KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE, 15 Apr 88]</i>	24
UkSSR Writers' Union Chief Argues for Freedom of Choice in Language Study		
<i>[Yu. Mushketik; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 17 May 88]</i>		25

#### SOCIAL ISSUES

Sociologists Hold Impromptu Roundtable on NKAO Issues	<i>[A. Brutyan; KOMMUNIST, 9 Jun 88]</i>	28
Procuracy Officials Want Better Criminal Investigators	<i>[Stolyarov; NEDELYA, 6-12 Jun 88]</i>	29
Youth Paper Admits Failure of Soviet/Czech Friendship Festival		
<i>[Ye. Kalyadina and Ya. Yuferova; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 11 Jun 88]</i>		33
IZVESTIYA Analyzes Solutions to Sugar Shortage	<i>[V. Nadein; IZVESTIYA, 7 May 88]</i>	36

#### REGIONAL ISSUES

Text of 21 Jun NKAO Soviet Decision	<i>[SOVETAKAN KARABAKH, No 145, 23 Jun 88]</i>	38
Kirovakan Officials Resist Construction of 1918 Armenian Victory Monument		
<i>[N. Mesropyan; KOMMUNIST, 24 Jun 88]</i>		38
Armenian Writer Khanzadyan on Causes, Meaning of NKAO Crisis		
<i>[S.N. Khanzadyan, S. Seyranyan; KOMMUNIST, 29 May 88]</i>		41
Yerevan University Official Advocates New Union, Autonomous Republics		
<i>[L. Karapetyan; KOMMUNIST, 25 Jun 88]</i>		43



**Estonian Creative Unions Radical Reform  
Proposals Published**

*18000418a Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian  
13 May 88 p 3*

[Text "Letter from a Joint Plenum of the Boards of the Creative Unions of the Estonian SSR to the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers and the Creative Intelligentsia of the Estonian SSR"]

[Text] While supporting the perestroika initiated in all spheres of the life of Soviet society by the CPSU Central Committee and the course toward perfecting democracy and radical economic reform, and recognizing the first steps that have been taken in our republic along the path of expanding democracy and glasnost, protecting the language and culture of the indigenous nationality, restricting migration into the republic, effecting environmental protection, and in other spheres, the plenum of the boards of the creative unions of the Estonian SSR notes with concern a number of processes and phenomena in our life that are hampering the course of perestroika and shaking the people's trust in the leading organs.

The disproportions in the economy are growing. In all spheres, including in cultural life, decentralization is insignificant. The idea of regional cost accounting for the Estonian SSR has been met with a disapproving attitude from above even though the course of extensive discussion of this idea testifies to the support for this proposal from the people. The continuing pressure from the all-union departments is blunting the sense of being the master and lowering the sense of responsibility in the actual producers. Plans for the exploitation of mineral resources in northeast Estonia have been augmented with very equivocal plans for construction in Tallinn and Narva that threaten to result in new and in principal insoluble economic, social and ecological problems. Resolution of the housing program is being considered in isolation from today's tasks of shaping a unified living environment.

The position of the Estonian language in the republic has not been settled. The up to now uncontrolled migration into the republic is exerting a dangerous influence on the demographic balance, and through this on the general economic and cultural situation, and is making it virtually impossible to resolve the housing problem and creating a tense atmosphere in society, particularly with regard to dealings between the nations. At the same time, incompetence and superficiality are observed in the assessment made of the national question in the Estonian SSR, and this issue is regarded merely as a problem of indoctrination.

As a result of all this, a demographic crisis threatens the preservation of the Estonians as a nation, and in order to resolve this, immediate and decisive steps are needed on

the part of the government. The plenum believes that it is a self-evident fact that in its activity the government of the Estonian SSR should regard the need to preserve and develop the Estonian people as a top-priority task. We support the view that real equality of the national cultures can be guaranteed only by protecting the priority of the Estonian language and culture across the entire territory of the Estonian SSR.

In our opinion, even until very recently the management of political life in Estonia has been characterized by a lack of competence, hastiness in decisionmaking, and a sense of nervousness. Instead of seeking out, finding and eliminating on the only basis possible—socioeconomic—the true causes of the existing shortcomings and tension, forces opposing perestroika have been trying to blame the existence of this tension either on external propaganda and the local mass media, or on nonformal groupings. Unfortunately, these accusations have been supported at important forums. Similar views have also been disseminated in the all-union press, which is showing the processes taking place in Estonia in an incorrect light.

The joint plenum of the boards of the creative unions of the Estonian SSR approve the information letters and proposals of the Cultural Council of the creative unions to the republic directive organs, in which letters the housing program, the phosphorite problem, glasnost, the substance and level of official information in the assessment of events and processes in our society, cost accounting for the Estonian SSR, establishment of Estonian as the state language, the compilation of special juridical acts and other problems were reviewed. We consider it essential to strengthen cooperation between the Cultural Council of the creative unions in the Estonian SSR and the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers.

The plenum appeals to the creative intelligentsia in the republic to use its talent, capabilities and creative potential to pursue the party course aimed at perestroika, proceeding from the directions and principles of the 27th CPSU Congress. To this end the plenum introduces the following proposals:

1. That the republic legislative organs sponsor change in the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Estonian SSR in order to guarantee the economic and cultural independence of the Estonian SSR and its right first and foremost to handle its own affairs itself.
2. That citizenship of the Estonian SSR be defined in the republic constitution and legislation.
3. That a course be set toward transferring the republic to full cost accounting; that ideas be worked on to make Estonia a special economic zone; that all materials from working groups working on the concept of regional cost accounting be made public.

4. That leading organs and the creative unions in the republic take specific steps to decentralize cultural life in the Estonian SSR.

5. That in order to overcome the lagging that has lasted for decades additional funding be made available for the rapid development of the material base for the sociocultural sphere.

6. That priority be restored to national scientific disciplines (language, folklore, archaeology, history, ethnography, anthropology and so forth) in our spiritual culture, and that allocations for their development be increased and training for scientific personnel be expanded.

7. That state support be provided for the development of scientific and cultural contacts with Estonians living outside Estonia.

8. That preliminary and objective information be provided for the entire population of the republic concerning all problems and plans connected with Estonia through the channels of the mass media, in both Estonian and Russian.

9. That preliminary public debate take place in the press on the fundamental decisions of the government of the Estonian SSR concerning key issues in the life of the republic.

That a system be set up and introduced to study public opinion on all urgent problems in public life, and that the results of such polls be regularly published.

10. That statistics on the status of Estonia's population and its living environment be published regularly.

11. That maximum glasnost be guaranteed in the republic with regard to the activity of the law enforcement organs and that those organs be really monitored by the public and the opportunities for violations of the law in those organs be reduced to a minimum at a time when in complex situations they may acquire a dangerous and provocative character.

12. That the mass actions to exile people that took place in the Estonian SSR in 1941 and during the postwar years be deemed unlawful, and that all acts serving as a basis for those actions be appealed in order to repeal them. That lists be published of all those repressed. That the Estonian SSR Museum of History contain a section in which all material relating to unlawful repressions during the period of Stalinism be housed. That a monument be set up to the innocent victims of Stalinism.

13. That all lists of books destroyed during the period 1940-1950 be published. That specific steps be taken to stock our libraries with the books contained in those lists and with the valuable literature in the national language that was destroyed.

14. That it be deemed essential to effect radical changes in existing construction policy.

15. That it be deemed impermissible to set up experimental sections at the phosphorite deposits in Rakvere and Toolse. That a Pandivereske national park be established and that further geological survey work be banned at the Rakvere (Lyaene-Kabalaske) deposit.

That disagreement be voiced against the present plan to expand the Pribaltiyskaya GRES and construct a plant for toxic chemicals in Maardu. That support be given for the position of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers according to which an oil-terminal port and a port for chemicals not be constructed in the republic. That radical steps be taken to eliminate the ecological emergency situation in the Bay of Pyarnu.

16. That support be given for significant measures to restrict immigration into the republic; and that at the same time work on and the implementation of significantly more radical measures be continued in order to achieve a negative balance in immigration into the Estonian SSR.

17. That everything necessary be done to restore the importance of Tartu as a cultural center. That obstacles on the road of realizing plans for construction of a Museum of the Estonian People be removed.

18. That significant changes be made in the position with respect to the publication of literature in the Estonian language, abandoning the large print runs for publications in Russian aimed at the all-union network of books sales, on which our stocks of paper and printing capacities are being spent. That publishing rights be extended to the creative unions and societies, higher educational establishments and scientific and cultural institutions.

19. That it be deemed necessary to emphasize that our people expect from the leadership of the Estonian SSR greater initiative and sense of principle in protecting the interests and constitutional rights of the republic. Proceeding from this, the plenum expresses dissatisfaction with the activity of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary K. Vayno and the Chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers B. Saula.

The creative intelligentsia of Soviet Estonia is aware of its own responsibility in the present complex but hopeful period. We see our task in cooperating closely with all who pin their hopes in perestroika—both workers and peasants and representatives of the intelligentsia, and the political leaders.

This letter adopted at the 2 April 1988 joint plenum of the creative unions of the Estonian SSR at the Toompea in Tallinn.

**Estonian 'Popular Front' Plans Criticized in Open Letters**

**Non-Estonian Interests Not Considered**  
18000570 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 7 Jun 88, p 3

[Open letter by A. Sashin: "Ambiguity Does Not Promote Trust"]

*[Text]* "In order to avoid the mistake which I have frequently noted in the recent past, I want to issue a warning: the ideas expressed in the documents of the unified plenum of the creative unions of Estonia and in the Bylaws of the Popular Front should not be identified with the statements of individuals in the press and over the radio and television...."

With these words Vladimir Rudenya, chairman of the workers' council of the "Dvigatel" Plant, began the discussion of the open letter of the enterprise's workers to the work collectives of Estonia, which took place a few days ago in the plant's "Mayak" Culture Center.

The auditorium, designed to accommodate 350, could not hold all the representatives of the plant's shops and subdivisions and those who simply wanted to attend. They stood in the corridors. The discussion was also attended by representatives of the Estonian CP Central Committee, the Morskoj Rayon Party Committee, the press, the radio, as well as delegates sent from other enterprises in Tallinn. The reason for this great interest was that the point of view of a collective numbering many thousands, most of them speaking Russian, concerning the development of interethnic relations in the republic was being fully and publicly expressed for the first time.

The plant's workers' council was the initiator. Following discussion in the enterprise's shops and subdivisions of the documents of the unified plenum of the creative unions of Estonia and the draft of the Bylaws of the Popular Front, the decision was made to create a commission to draft an appeal or letter that would express the viewpoint of the collective of the "Dvigatel" Plant.

Incidentally, a proposal to that effect had been made back in February. But at that time, having consulted with the plant's party committee and the party raykom and taking into account the complicated and unclear situation, they decided not to come forth with their opinion at the time. But the situation did not clear up, and half a year later they returned once again to this idea.

During the 2.5 hours the discussion lasted, more than 20 persons took the floor. Nor was it any accident that the Popular Front was the main topic of discussion. After all, it is precisely the process of its organization that has brought into focus and displayed all the problems of interethnic relations in the republic. All of the speeches were delivered with an interrogative intonation. The

looseness of expression, the vagueness, and the ambiguity of some of the phrasings in the documents of the unified plenum of the creative unions and the Bylaws of the Popular Front had aroused people's legitimate concern. They demanded clarity.

In the words of the speakers, almost all of them approved the actual idea of the Popular Front in support of restructuring. But the fact that the Popular Front is still being formed for the present on an ethnic basis, whether its initiators desire that or not, is making people cautious and suspicious as to the authenticity of the proclaimed goals of that movement.

Unfortunately, the discussion was not attended by any of the representatives of the creative unions or initiators of creation of the Popular Front who might have answered the questions that were put. As Sergey Pasko, deputy secretary of the plant party committee, explained to me, there had been an organizational slipup. They had invited Marya Lauristin and Vladimir Beckman on the last day, but they were unable to come, since they already had an arrangement with other collectives for that day.

I will cite a single example to portray the emotional atmosphere which prevailed in the meeting. Vladimir Popov, a veteran of labor and the party, began his speech in the "good" old traditions:

"What is happening? All kinds of dyed-in-the-wool nationalists, these hairy mongrels of capitalism, sucking on the thumb of the nationality question..." and so on.

The indignant audience demanded that he stop the insults or leave the speaker's stand.

The proposal of Andrey Khodov—to conduct a demonstration in defense of the interests of the Russian-speaking population was also rejected after discussion on grounds that it would enflame ethnic discord.

In conclusion the assembly approved an open letter and proposed that it be brought to the attention of all work collectives and all workers in Estonia.

**Open Letter of the Workers of the "Dvigatel" Plant imeni V.I. Lenin to Work Collectives of Estonian SSR**

Having familiarized ourselves carefully with the declaration proposed by the Popular Front and the material of the unified plenum of the boards of the creative unions of Estonian SSR, we support everything that promotes the success of restructuring. But in our view, some of the points in those documents are in need of thorough examination by specialists, some things seem to us debatable, and we reject some of the points, which excessively dramatize the situation and supercharge the tension.

We support the idea of creating the Popular Front as one of the forms of the people's self-government, an idea born in the course of restructuring in its most crucial stage. We also support the idea of republic cost accounting, which would link the level of the republic's economic and social development to the size of the national income produced. This is a development of the party line.

Conversion of the ESSR to full cost accounting is the foundation of the economic platform in the declaration of the Popular Front. But at the same time, it does not take into account the fact that the socialist enterprise is the principal entity in the restructuring of the economic mechanism and its work collective is the principal agent. Now that the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) has taken effect, all work collectives have elected their full-fledged councils. The elections took place in an atmosphere of expanding democracy and glasnost and of comprehensive discussion of the proposed candidates and altogether suited the spirit of restructuring. That is why we feel that the primary entities of the Popular Front should not be support groups, but workers' councils, which are the fully authorized representatives of the workers and are capable of performing economic and social tasks, of taking decisions, and of taking responsibility for them before their own collectives, as well as similar self-management bodies of various organizations, institutions, creative unions, and so on, with the right to make decisions. At the same time, support groups associated with workers' councils might represent an active part of the Popular Front, a conductor of its ideas in the masses.

As for economic activity, here the Popular Front must not restrict itself solely to such large-scale problems as full cost accounting of the republic, but it might take upon itself the solution of current problems, for example, protecting the population against the continuous rise of prices which individual enterprises have hiked up on the pretext of the conversion to cost accounting or production of "particularly stylish" products, extending oversight to the work of certain cooperatives and organizations in the trade sector that have been unlawfully reaping fantastic profits from shortages through the "shady" economy, and other similar issues affecting the workers' standard of living.

We believe that the idea of transferring enterprises at the union level to republic jurisdiction would in the present situation signify only a change of one "master" for another. It is more important, it seems to us, to grant full independence to enterprises themselves and to create the conditions for their motivation to develop the republic's economy. This would promote a growth of their contribution to performing the socioeconomic tasks of Estonian SSR. Although even now our enterprise is doing quite a bit toward those goals. We are producing consumer goods for the inhabitants of Estonia, we are rendering services to its population, we have business ties with many enterprises in the republic, and we are

taking part in the city's construction. By laying the heating line from the "Iru" TETs we have provided heat to 18 of the city's organizations and institutions. We have built residential buildings, for "Marat" and "Vodokanal" in particular, and the stores "Pae" and "Kiev." Then there is our contribution to building the airport, the hotel "Viru," and erecting the viaduct on Pyarnusko耶 Shosse, construction of the Stadium imeni Komomolsk and the Olympic Sailing Center (the Olympic cup was designed and made by the hands of "Dvigatel" designers and workers). Many forms for reinforced-concrete fabrications used in building the city's projects were also made at our plant. We are also giving gratis help to rural inhabitants—with trucks and tractors and their repairs, equipment, and materials. We have been giving help to bring in the harvest and put by animal feed—in particular to the "Kalevipoeg" Kolkhoz in Paydeskiy Rayon and the "Putkaste" Sovkhoz-Tekhnikum in Khiyumaaskiy Rayon. And this aside from the fact that the enterprise is performing exceedingly important state assignments which equally affect the interests of the republic and those of the country as a whole.

Extensive economic methods have had an adverse effect on development of the social sphere of our enterprise as well, and that is why we also understand problems related to migration and are ready for our part to take part in solving them. We believe that the situation should be improved by raising labor productivity, through scientific-technical progress, by applying advanced technologies, through resource-conserving measures, so as to produce more output with fewer workers. Aside from everything else, this is now being complicated by the huge bureaucratic apparatus: in our republic the percentage of people directly employed in industry and construction is too low. And conversely—the number of swollen administrative structures, organizations, institutions, and so on that duplicate one another is too large. We see here a huge field of activity for the Popular Front: to set up a barrier to antirestructuring processes, to become a kind of defensive front against bureaucracy, against the power of the administration over elective bodies, against its desire by every means to preserve its size and its privileges, to prevent the proceedings of soviets of people's deputies from being turned into a formality, and against attempts to revive Stalinism and the time of the stagnation.

And this is actually what the declaration of the Popular Front speaks about. Unfortunately, in the 12 points of this document we have not found a word about the Popular Front's attention to resolutely combat manifestations of chauvinism and nationalism and their propaganda and all attempts to split the republic's working class and working people.

Now as never before we need unity and mutual aid of all people inhabiting Soviet Estonia, and the Popular Front could be one of the centers of interethnic friendship in actual fact, not in declarative fashion.

The proposed sociopolitical platform for the Popular Front's activity, expressed in the appeal of the unified plenum of the boards of creative unions of Estonian SSR and the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the letter to the leading authorities of ESSR does not in our view reflect the interests of all the nationalities living on the territory of Estonian SSR. We will mention some lines from the letter: "The plenum deems it self-evident that in its activity the government of Estonian SSR should see it as a task of paramount importance to preserve and develop the Estonian people." It seems to us that this phrase should have been extended with the words: "Insofar and with methods that do not infringe the interests of other nationalities and ethnic groups living in the republic." Otherwise, one must ask: And how about the other non-Estonian population—full-fledged citizens of the USSR? If we examine some of the points in the letter from this point of view, then we can draw conclusions with far-reaching and disturbing consequences for all those who come under that definition.

For example, Point 14 speaks about the need for "radical change of the present construction policy." What is this point supposed to signify to an inhabitant who does not belong to the indigenous nationality? Will he still have an opportunity to obtain social benefits such as housing, schools, kindergartens on a par with Estonians?

Or: "...continue to elaborate and carry out considerably more radical measures in order to achieve a negative net result of migration in Estonian SSR." And how do they intend to achieve this, even in general terms? Unfortunately, the letter does not shed light on all these questions. But the main thing is that the document does not contain even a hint that all the changes being demanded must be carried out so that they are not detrimental to the interest of developing other nationalities living in Soviet Estonia.

Recently, we have been hearing over the radio, seeing on television, and reading in the newspapers statements of public figures, scientists, and journalists, treating the ideas expressed in the plenum in different ways depending on their audience. This ambiguity always results in less than full understanding. In this case, it opens the door to the Popular Front to anyone who is fighting for restructuring in what he says, but pursues his own ends in what he does—ends such as ethnic discord, a breakup of the working class, the peasantry, and all the workers.

The plenum has demanded "establishment of the Estonian language as the official language." While we support the need to preserve the way of life and traditions and guarantee the Estonian nationality's right to a future and to full-fledged development, we still do not consider it sensible in the present situation to establish the Estonian language as the official language by an administrative decision. We hold the same opinion concerning definition of citizenship in Estonian SSR. We are all aware—and this has been proven by history—that prohibitive measures and edicts have not led to anything good. It only makes fertile soil for unnecessary conflicts in a

certain segment of the population and the possibility that the rights of certain inhabitants of Soviet Estonia will be infringed on by civil servants and bureaucrats. Creating the necessary conditions for the Russophone population to study the Estonian language is a different matter. How much can be said about that? And perhaps instead of empty talk we might move on to real action? And why not involve in this first of all the creative intelligentsia, mobilizing activists of the Popular Front to create study circles and courses (not on a cooperative basis, but on a civic basis).

The material of the plenum of the creative unions, it seems to us, has served as an impetus for numerous articles in the press, a sizable portion of which has been aimed at creating the image of the so-called "migrant"—a person with a low level of culture, education, and skills, of a kind of tumbleweed, extending this portrayal to a major portion of the inhabitants not belonging to the indigenous nationality. This is arousing legitimate indignation in the Russophone community, including our own plant. Many of us have been living in Estonia for a long time, working honestly, we have put down our roots here, we have raised our children, we have buried our near and dear in Estonian earth, and we do not think of ourselves as living in a foreign land.

The Estonian community, while supporting the Popular Front, while fully accepting its sociopolitical platform, has unfortunately not been thinking about how this is perceived by people of other nationalities. This creates a situation of divergence and distrust among the republic's workers.

We, on the other hand, seeing in this sociopolitical platform of the Popular Front the possibility of an infringement of our rights, are compelled to fight for its revision.

We appeal to the work collectives of Estonia that they show restraint, calm, and mutual respect for the dignity, culture, and language of every ethnic group; that they thoroughly analyze the proposals advanced by the initiators of creation of the Popular Front, appraise them objectively, and express their opinion openly.

We propose that the efforts of work collectives be united in support of restructuring, that a program of joint action be discussed and outlined, and that a conference of workers' councils be called for this purpose in which representatives of the creative intelligentsia would take part.

#### Conflicts With Constitution Noted

18000570 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 7 Jun 88 p 3

[Open letter of the Presidium of the Tallinn Section of the Soviet War Veterans Committee: "Our Considerations"]

[Text] The Tallinn Section of the Committee of Veterans of the Great Patriotic War, having discussed in its

meeting on 27 May 1988 the issues concerning creation of the Popular Front in Estonian SSR, declare the following:

We, participants in the Great Patriotic War, warmly support the restructuring of our socialist society which began on the initiative of the CPSU and Soviet Government, which is being carried out under the leadership of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, with the active support of the entire Soviet people, on the basis of the strategic line adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress, concretized and expanded in subsequent decrees and decisions of the CPSU and Soviet Government. Everything to the advantage of socialism, in the interests of the Soviet people, in the interests of strengthening our multinational state in the Leninist interpretation and understanding of this matter, we will actively, together with the working masses, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia, under the political leadership of the CPSU, and with the broad activity of soviets of people's deputies, implement, and we will perform the specific tasks of restructuring. That is why we support the popular initiative, which in deeds rather than words leads to the support of restructuring and improvement of socialism.

As for the ideas of creating the Popular Front published in VECHERNIY TALLIN in the form of the responses of Edgar Savisaar to the questions of the editors of that newspaper and in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in an interview with Gustav Tynspoeg, the Tallinn Section of the Soviet War Veterans Committee would like to express its position.

Insofar as the creation of the Popular Front to support restructuring is concerned, the entire people, all strata of society: the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, war veterans and labor veterans, soldiers and sailors in the Soviet Army and Navy, and all public organizations, including the CPSU, must take part in that support as we understand it. Consequently, all strata of the population of Estonian SSR, all nationalities without exception living in ESSR, representatives of our section and also of the republic Council of War and Labor Veterans, and other public organizations must be represented on the provisional republic center of the Popular Front.

Then we can entirely believe that what is being created is truly a popular front in support of restructuring, and that in all respects it takes the strategic line of the CPSU as its point of departure. At present, the makeup of the initiating group does not confirm that strategic line.

First of all, since the initiating group in one of the original "We Still Think..." programs announced the creation of a mass political movement in Estonia, a popular front, a clear political objective and strategic line based on the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, not the decisions of the unified plenum of the creative

unions published in the appeal of the unified plenum of the creative unions of ESSR to the 19th Party Conference and the letter to the bodies of leadership of ESSR, must be made public.

Third, we cannot fully concur in the so-called leading idea of the Popular Front. It is very narrow and limited and expresses more the views of a small group of representatives of the intelligentsia than of the entire people and representatives of all the nationalities living in ESSR.

For example, the ideas about cultural autonomy of all nationalities. As we understand it, this means denial of interethnic relations in the domain of culture, above all of the Estonian people with the cultures of other nationalities of the Soviet Union, that is, cultural exclusiveness and self-isolation. Such a position runs counter to socialism in its Leninist conception and is alien to the interests of a majority of the population of all the nationalities of ESSR.

Fourth, nor can we recognize and accept the sociopolitical program of action of the Popular Front, which is based on the principles of that same appeal of the unified plenum of the creative unions. It contradicts the ESSR Constitution (Title 3, Article 19), where it says that "the state shall promote greater social homogeneity of society—erasure of class differences, essential differences between city and country, between mental and physical labor, comprehensive development and convergence of all the nationalities and ethnic groups of the USSR."

Fifth, along with the correct views of the unified plenum of the creative unions expressed in the appeal and subsequent statements of representatives of the creative intelligentsia—L. Meri, E. Vetemaa, V. Beekman, E. Savisaar, and others, there are erroneous and politically immature views that contradict the spirit of socialism and the main strategies and essence of restructuring.

As we have already said, restructuring was initiated and is being directed by the CPSU. Consistent with the USSR Constitution, the CPSU is the leading and guiding force of Soviet society, the nucleus of its political system and of state and public organizations, of all without exception. The Popular Front is no exception. The initiating group proclaims that the Popular Front is not subordinate to any other organization or body. As we understand it, judging by the views of the initiating group, it is supposed to stand above the CPSU, above the constitutional authorities (soviets). This position contradicts the ESSR Constitution (Title 1, Articles 1 and 2). Not to mention the fact that this is an actual denial of the leading role of the CPSU in our society. As the initiating group explains in its document, the CPSU exerts its influence within the Popular Front (note that it says only "influence," not "leading role") solely by means of its ability to convince. This position cannot be one that we accept without reservation. Denial of the leading role of the CPSU in the Popular Front has also been expressed

in the thesis that persons elected or appointed to a position of responsibility in the party, Komsomol, or government administration cannot be members of the bodies of leadership of the Popular Front. A legitimate question arises as to where these party members will display their ability to convince the leading figures of the future Popular Front? All citizens of ESSR, regardless of their position or nationality, are to take an active part in restructuring, as we see it, and they have the right to be elected to any elective bodies, including the bodies of leadership of the Popular Front. The opposite point of view contradicts the ESSR Constitution (Title 5, Articles 31, 32, and 34). It is around these articles that many of the muddled, erroneous, and politically harmful expressions of the representatives of the creative intelligentsia and initiators of the creation of the Popular Front in ESSR revolve. While expressing our readiness for open discussion of the questions of further democratization of the life of society, the Tallinn Section of the Soviet War Veterans Committee, representing more than 10,000 participants in the Great Patriotic War, cannot fully concur in the idea of the initiating group about creation of the Popular Front on principles that contradict the Constitution of the Soviet Union and Estonian SSR.

#### Founding Member Responds to Objections

18000570 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 26 Jun 88 p 6

[Interview with Marya Lauristin, head of the journalism department at Tallinn State University and member of the initiating center of the Popular Front, by M. Mets: "The Popular Front and Ethnic Relations"; date and place not given; originally published in RAKHVA KHYAEL, 17 June]

[Text] [Question] The movement for a popular front in support of restructuring has come into that phase where people now have quite a few questions, which indicates that by no means everyone perceives the idea of the movement in the same way. We called upon Marya Lauristin, head of the journalism department at Tallinn State University and a member of the initiating center of the Popular Front, to answer some of these questions.

[Answer] The open letter of the Presidium of the Tallinn Veterans Council contains the reproach that the Popular Front expresses the views of only a small group of the intelligentsia, not of the entire people, including the workers and peasants—and not the interests of all the nationalities living in Estonia. It also asks why the Popular Front is not following the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, but is guided in its political platform by the material of the unified plenum of the creative unions of Estonia.

The movement's very first declaration stated that the purpose of the Popular Front was by active deeds to support the course of restructuring proclaimed by the CPSU; so that there can be no question of whether we support the decisions of the 27th party congress. We do

rely largely on the material of the unified plenum of the creative unions because in our opinion it enumerates most accurately the sore points in the life of the republic. It thus makes no sense to ask whether support of the decisions of the unified plenum preclude support of the party congress. I advise that our declaration and the material of the plenum be given another thoughtful reading.

The reproach to the effect that the Popular Front expresses the views of only a small group of the intelligentsia may result only from a lack of information or a wrong interpretation of information. After the idea was expressed of creating the Popular Front on the television program "We Still Think" (13 April), it was in enterprises and on farms that it began to be discussed most vigorously. Now half of the numerous support groups are groups in the production workplace.

[Question] It seems to me that the main trouble lies in the vagueness of the Popular Front's attitude toward other nationalities, non-Estonian. That was the reason for the letter from the workers of the "Dvigatel" Plant, who see the Popular Front as an ethnic front.

[Answer] The Popular Front brings together all the nationalities living in Estonia; participation in the movement is not limited by party affiliation, by beliefs, or by nationality.

[Question] That same letter contains a reproach as to why the Popular Front has nowhere published its program on the nationality question and why there are only individual propositions.

[Answer] The Popular Front still does not have the final draft of its program, but only working theses. Nationality issues are now being given thorough treatment. This program will, of course, take into account the particular features of a national or ethnic republic, but this will be done so as to prevent ethnic inequality.

Unfortunately, at the present time many people coming to live in Estonia are not aware that in coming here they have crossed a state border, have entered a sovereign union republic which has its own ethnic features which they must take into account. But we are working for cultural autonomy for all the nationalities living in Estonia. And to have the opportunity to create our own culture here, on the soil of our republic, so that equal cultural contacts among nationalities might be engendered.

We are aware that the key issue for the Popular Front is now the question: Will we be able to attract representatives of other nationalities in solving the problems of our republic and in putting an end to the spread of rumors about ethnic discrimination? In no case can we allow

squabbles on this topic, we need to clarify our position and issue objective information. The desire to represent the Popular Front as mainly an ethnic front is a provocation.

[Question] Representatives of 150 ethnic groups live in Tallinn, and the road to the Popular Front is open to them all.

**Non-Estonians are offended by the term "migrant," which seems to be equivalent to labeling the newcomer as someone without culture, without education, and with a low level of professional skill.**

[Answer] Yes, there is something wrong with our technology. Migrant is often used to signify a non-Estonian. But not every non-Estonian is a migrant, just as not every migrant is a non-Estonian. An Estonian who has moved from the country to the city is, strictly speaking, a migrant. Migrants are the first generation of people who have moved. Not everyone living in Estonia who does not belong to the indigenous nationality is a migrant. What is more even a majority of Estonians who now live in cities can be called migrants in a sense because at one time we were altogether a rural and peasant people.

There is nothing insulting in the scientific term "migrant." Of course, among the migrants there are uneducated and uncultured newcomers, but these words are not synonymous.

A certain prejudice toward the term "migrant" may come from its similarity to the term "emigrant"; after all, for decades we were taught to take a negative attitude toward them.

[Question] Some more questions from the letter of the veterans already referred to: Why is the Popular Front not subordinate to any body or organization? Why does the published material of the Popular Front state that the party can influence this movement, but cannot play a leading role in it?

[Answer] The Popular Front is a democratic movement relying on civic initiative. The idea that the people and its initiative must obligatorily be subordinate to someone or something dates from the time of the stagnation. At that time, this point of view was typical and the only possible one. Party leadership does not always signify organizational subordination to the party. Our declaration does in fact say that the influence of the CPSU is ensured by democratic methods, relies on the political prestige of party members who belong to the Popular Front, and on their ability to persuade. The only right way for a democratic popular movement is to oppose the attempts of the bureaucracy to preserve and revive dogmas and forms of administration typical of the era of the stagnation. At the same time, this does not preclude, but on the contrary necessitates, dialogue with various organizations and bodies.

[Question] The theses of the Popular Front contain a caveat that the positions of leadership in its bodies must not be combined with positions of leadership in the administration of the party, Komsomol, the trade unions, or the government. The veterans ask in this connection: Why such restrictions? After all, all citizens of the USSR regardless of position occupied must take part equally in restructuring.

[Answer] I think that to clarify this it is sufficient to cite an example from the present sociopolitical system. After all, at an enterprise one and the same person cannot be at the same time the secretary of the party organization and the chairman of the trade union committee. That same principle operates at the level of republic and union authorities. But this restriction does not hinder leading officials from taking part in the proceedings of support groups of the Popular Front.

[Question] The workers of "Dvigatel" propose that the Popular Front not limit itself to economic issues, the problems of republic cost accounting, but also include in the sphere of its interests such current problems as the constant rise of prices of consumer goods, verifying the activity of cooperative and trade enterprises.

[Answer] The economic platform of the Popular Front is based on the idea of the transition of Estonian SSR to full cost accounting. This does not preclude support groups from setting themselves more immediate specific goals within that framework, taking into account the particular features of their own enterprises, cities, and rayons. Of course, there are certain limits here. It would not be right at all if the Popular Front were to begin to look for opportunities, say, to repair the ventilation in some shop.

It is a good thing that the workers at "Dvigatel" have thought through for themselves the problems of the Popular Front and have reacted. Its program was put forth for discussion. In the very near future representatives of the initiating center of the Popular Front will be meeting with the collective of "Dvigatel." I believe that there will be a dialogue useful to both sides. After all, our common concern is how to find the basis for joining together the interests of Estonians and all the nationalities living here.

*P.S. The planned meeting of the Popular Front and the collective of the "Dvigatel" Plant has taken place.*

07045

#### **Georgian CC Censures South Ossetian Officials for Reform-Lagging**

18-00268 Theses ZARYA VONDA 4 in Russian  
28 Apr 88 pp 1-2

[Report by Georgian Information Agency, under the rubric "In the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee" - "The Price of Dependency and Indifference".]

[Text] The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has examined the question "On Serious Shortcomings in the Socioeconomic Development of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast and Additional Measures to Accelerate It."

As is known, an outbreak of abdominal typhoid occurred recently in Tskhinvali. 138 persons were hospitalized, and the diagnosis of the disease was confirmed in 86 cases. At the present time, as the result of steps taken the situation has stabilized, all patients have received medical care, the questions that have arisen of establishing sanitary conditions are being resolved in a prompt fashion, and problems in the work of the municipal services in the oblast capital and the region as a whole are being eliminated. The republic agencies and all appropriate ministries and departments have been involved in this work.

The mass outbreak of disease in Tskhinvali evoked a broad public response and open public dissatisfaction with the work of local executive agencies, which had shown complete disregard for the municipal-service needs of Tskhinvali's inhabitants and taken an irresponsible approach to the problems of the sanitary and technical condition of water mains and sewer systems and, in general, to the issues of social and consumer services that have worried oblast residents for a long time.

A study of the situation locally, meetings and conversations with the oblast's residents, and sociological surveys of the population have shown that in many spheres of life in South Ossetia there is evidence of unfavorable tendencies and phenomena associated with stagnation, that decisions previously adopted by republic agencies to accelerate its economic and social development are not being satisfactorily implemented, and that party, soviet and economic-management agencies have not drawn the proper conclusions from the serious criticism that the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has repeatedly leveled at them regarding the restructuring of their work style and methods and their attitude toward resolving urgent issues and problems.

Questions associated with the further development of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast's economy and culture have always been at the center of the daily attention of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic Council of Ministers. Over the period 1974-1985, three joint decrees of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic government, were adopted on questions of the autonomous oblast's economic and social development. 435 million rubles was allocated for improving the physical facilities and equipment of the branches of its economy. All this has had a certain positive impact on the oblast's socioeconomic development, unfortunately, however, hopes that these measures would produce the proper results have not been justified. Consequently, the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast lags substantially behind average republic indices in terms of both its level of overall economic development and the development of leading branches of its economy.

The use of the autonomous oblast's economic potential and its potential for providing acceptable social and consumer services for its population has been extremely

unsatisfactory. In industry plans for the sale of output are chronically unfulfilled, and a considerable number of enterprises fail to cope with them. Assignments for the spending of capital investments, construction and installation work, and the commissioning of fixed assets, especially those of a social nature, regularly go unfulfilled. For a number of years agriculture has hardly developed at all, moreover, in terms of certain important indices it has even lost ground, and the branch is in exceptionally grave condition. Per capita trade lags substantially behind average republic indices, while plans for trade turnover go chronically unfulfilled. The operation of trade facilities lacks the proper order, and various violations and negative phenomena are widespread and common. The assortment of consumer services fails to satisfy the population's most urgent needs. The performance of health-care facilities, municipal-service and transport enterprises and cultural institutions receives a great deal of criticism. The population is frequently supplied with substandard drinking water. At the same time, money allocated for the construction and reconstruction of water-supply installations is not being fully put to use.

South Ossetia's party organizations and soviet agencies, and executives of oblast, city and rayon housing and municipal services, trade, consumer services, health care, culture and education have not only manifested an impermissible inertia and negligence in solving urgent socioeconomic problems, but frequently fail to deal even with the most elementary, urgent questions of the daily life of the city, rayons and oblast as a whole, which arouses justifiable dissatisfaction and legitimate criticism among the autonomous oblast's inhabitants. Executives of the autonomous oblast's party and soviet agencies rarely make local visits, to all intents and purposes have avoided association with people, and do not study and have a poor knowledge of the population's needs and requirements. Moreover, cases are known in which they received urgent signals but often left them without response.

The decree adopted by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee emphasizes that serious shortcomings in solving the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast's high-priority socioeconomic problems stem first and foremost from obsolete work methods on the part of its executive agencies, which have not been able to rid themselves of the alien encrustations of the period of stagnation, reach the level of restructuring, and march in step with the times of renewal. Today this is even further aggravating mistakes and omissions, for it is impossible to satisfy the new, higher requirements while working in the old way.

The leadership of the party obkom (Comrade F. S. Sanakoyev) has failed to draw principled conclusions from the criticism of its work style and methods that was voiced in the discussion of the obkom's report in the bureau of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee at the beginning of 1987. The requirements of

restructuring have not become the main guideline for the improvement of party leadership. As before, the obkom's work has been dominated by superficiality in the approach and attitude toward business, an inability to foresee the consequences of decisions that are made, a lack of self-criticism in appraising the results of its performance, and an enthusiasm for command-administrative methods and a bureaucratic style. The establishment of democratic principles in party work, including in the selection and advancement of personnel, has been slow and, for the most part, pro forma. Demands on executives have frequently been inadequate and unobjective, and resolute efforts have not been made to eradicate the principles of personal loyalty, nepotism and clannishness in personnel policy. The party apparatus has sometimes supplanted elective agencies and failed to give their members room to show initiative, principle and a free exchange of views in dealing with urgent matters.

Serious oversights have been made in ideological and political upbringing work and in the spiritual and moral development of the working people and young people; in a number of cases this has contributed to the development of incorrect attitudes and unhealthy manifestations in public life.

The oblast soviet ispolkoms (Comrade A. A. Kachmazov) has tolerated the secondary role that has been assigned to it in managing the socioeconomic processes taking place within the oblast and has failed to take sufficiently vigorous steps to overcome existing stagnation-related phenomena. A lack of resolve, a tendency to look for instructions from above, and the failure to hold subordinate services and subdivisions and economic executives accountable for the full-fledged performance of their assigned functions, especially in the sphere of social development—such is a characterization of the ispolkoms' work, which has failed to deal with many questions pertaining to the satisfaction of the population's vital requirements and needs.

The shortcomings and deviations that have been allowed to occur in South Ossetia's socioeconomic development are also due, to a considerable extent, to a lack of attention on the part of a number of republic ministries and departments to the implementation of measures stipulated by decrees of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers regarding the autonomous oblast, and to the failure on their part to provide daily and interested assistance and supervision of the work of appropriate oblast organizations.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has deemed the work of the South Ossetian Party Obkom and Oblast Soviet Ispolkoms in managing the autonomous oblast's socioeconomic development and the solution of a number of extremely important problems connected with its population's living conditions to be unsatisfactory.

The decision of the 22 April 1988 Plenum of the South Ossetian Obkom of the Georgian Communist Party to relieve F. S. Sanakoyev of his duties as first secretary of the party obkom is deemed to have been correct and in accordance with the requirements of the times and the spirit of restructuring.

Comrade A. A. Kachmazov, chairman of the South Ossetian Oblast Ispolkoms and member of the CPSU, has received a strict reprimand for insufficient attention to the resolution of high-priority social issues and lax oversight over the work of services under his jurisdiction in satisfying the urgent needs and requirements of the population. He has been admonished concerning his personal responsibility for the state of the autonomous oblast's socioeconomic development.

Comrade G. V. Kochisev, first secretary of the Tskhinvali Party Gorkom has received a reprimand to be recorded in his permanent work record, and Comrade V. S. Besayev, chairman of the city ispolkoms and member of the CPSU, has received a strict reprimand for their unsatisfactory management of the development of Tskhinvali's social sphere and serious shortcomings in the provision of services to the population.

Comrade N. N. Nefedov, Georgian SSR minister of housing and municipal services and member of the CPSU, has received a reprimand for lax oversight over services under his jurisdiction and the failure to take prompt steps to provide the population of Tskhinvali with quality drinking water.

Comrade I. I. Pagava, republic deputy minister of health and chief state sanitation inspector, and member of the CPSU, has received a reprimand for the failure to ensure the proper sanitary order on the territory of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast and the failure to hold the executives of appropriate local agencies sufficiently accountable.

The Bureau of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has strictly admonished Comrade A. O. Movsessyan, Georgian SSR minister of trade, and Comrade K. N. Shavishvili, chairman of the board of Tsekavshini, regarding inadequate supervision of and attention to the questions of providing trade services to the population of Tskhinvali and the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast as a whole. The attention of the executives of the Georgian SSR State Agroindustrial Committee (Comrades L. A. Gurtskaya and O. Sh. Tsomaya) has been called to the inadequacy of assistance provided to agencies of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast in resolving issues of development, the agroindustrial complex, and the supplying of essential agricultural products to the population.

The bureau has ordered the South Ossetian Party Obkom (Comrade A. G. Chekhov) to carry out a comprehensive and thorough analysis of the situation that exists in the autonomous oblast in the sphere of the economy and

social life, define a specific program for its radical improvement and enhancement, restructure all organizational and political work in the spirit of the requirements of the 27th Party Congress and subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, and pay special attention to the need to expand glasnost, establish democratic principles in work, regularly study public opinion and the needs and requirements of the population, maintain constant contact with people, see to their correct ideological and political development, and reinforce healthy internationality relations. The obkom is instructed to take appropriate action with regard to executives guilty of shortcomings and violations that arouse justifiable criticism from the public.

The attention of the executives of republic agencies, ministries and departments and departments of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has been called to the need to give greater attention to the solution of social, economic and ideological problems that are urgent for the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast, and to provide specific assistance in overcoming existing shortcomings in any given sphere and in the practical accomplishment of the tasks of restructuring.

In light of the discussion of the question, a decree of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, "On Urgent Measures for the Further Socioeconomic Development of the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast," has been adopted.

Bitter, it turns out, have been the fruits of dependency and the lack of a systematic approach in the work of the party, soviet and economic-management agencies of the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast, whereby its executives have too often taken a wait-and-see position with regard to problems that have arisen, have tacitly blamed one another or engaged in empty discussions when what

was required were decisive actions, have looked with indifference on the disorder in the provision of services to the population, and have failed to take to heart the needs and requirements of people who have tried for years to gain an audience with high officials. Their claims that they did not know or were only informed at the very last moment about outrages in municipal services and the disastrous condition of the water-supply and sewer systems are vivid evidence of how they have violated the sacred commandments governing the work of an executive who has been endowed with the people's authority but who closets himself in the quiet of a prestigious office and totally forgets about his chief duty—to care for people.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Buro has provided the executives of the oblast and the city of Tskhinvali the opportunity to rectify their mistakes, give a good accounting of themselves, and accomplish a drastic change in their actions and attitudes toward their official responsibilities and duty as party members. Time for this has been granted. Otherwise they will be held to the strictest party accounting.

But elimination of the distortions in party policy and the shortcomings in the development of all spheres of the region's sociopolitical and socioeconomic life does not depend on them alone. South Osetia's party organization must draw up and implement a specific program for improving the atmosphere; enhancing the role and responsibility of all party units and all Communists for the state of affairs; establishing the practice of glasnost, criticism and self-criticism; involving the broad masses in management; and instilling in people a proprietary attitude and sense of involvement in everything that constitutes our society's present day.

8756

**Afanasyev Urges Separation of History, Ideology**  
*18000561 Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA in Russian No 24, 17 Jun 88 pp 2-3, 8-9*

[Article by Yuri Afanasyev, doctor of historical sciences, delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference: "Perestroyka and Historical Knowledge"]

[Text] Taking the path of radical change, coincident with the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, forces all of us to think and interpret our past and accomplishments. We must determine the reason for which, despite its entire past experience, to this day our society has preserved the spiritual unity inherent in our people, nurtured by the impetus which can be traced to October 1917.... Nonetheless, we also say that despite the tremendous efforts which occasionally seemed simply inhuman; despite the stubborn work of several generations of Soviet people; and despite tremendous sacrifices, we did not achieve a socialism of the kind which Lenin and the Leninist guard envisaged in the 1920s. That is precisely why we reached the conclusion of the need for a reorganization of our society and for ascribing to this restructuring a revolutionary nature. Hence the difficulty of the first question: Why did we build in such a way that today we must restructure? And if we turned away from the path opened by the October Revolution, we should know where, when and why and under what circumstances did this happen?

This is no simple question, for it affects the essence of our community life and, obviously, historians are as yet to answer it and, above all, to realize the significance this has in terms of social awareness.

A variety of viewpoints, occasionally polarized, are being expressed. According to some, the social system which was established and became reality in the USSR, sometimes described as "Stalinism," was the most rational and even the triumphal completion of the October Revolution and that no alternative to this path existed. Others claimed that there was such a historical alternative and that in the 1920's it was represented by powerful forces, the embodiment of which was N.I. Bukharin. Possibly, were we to launch more profound theoretical and specific historical studies, we would develop a better concept of other trends in the development of our society, trends which were not followed in the past. In turn, this faces us with the more general problem of alternatives, of historical choices, of the need to abandon our dogmatized historical materialism which presents the entire path after the October Revolution as a straight-line process, controlled by a priori, by predetermined "laws." Awareness of historical alternatives is of great importance in the self-orientation of man today. For an alternative does not mean simply an "either-or" choice. It also implies making constant choices. In terms of perestroyka, for example, this means that a choice has already been made, that it represents an alternative to Stalinism, stagnation and illegality as a system, an alternative to corruption.

Yet perestroyka itself is not something given in advance and determined once and for all. It is merely the general framework of democratization of the country, within which a variety of choices are possible, choices which, in turn, determine the nature of the process. That is precisely why today the polyphony of voices is so important, even though they may be dissonant. What is important is the possibility itself of voicing different ideas, plans, suggestions and platforms of different trends and types, including, possibly, some which are independent, which are not necessarily anyone's "organ." It is only the open competition among a great variety of ideas that can bring about a free, a democratic choice of the ways leading to the intensification of perestroyka. It is precisely at this point that history blends with politics and the past with the present.

The solution of such fundamental problems, which did not face our social science in the past so urgently and in such a formulation as they do today, requires not only courage but also profound scientific research based on the study of historical materials. It is important to understand why the attempt at restructuring our society and its democratization, which was undertaken by the 20th CPSU Congress and after it, did not succeed; what was the nature of the forces which blocked reform in the 1960's, and why was it that the criticism of the so-called "cult of Stalin's personality" proved at that time to be incomplete and inconsistent, for the social structures which had taken shape during Stalin's time once again prevailed, and that same phenomenon—"Stalinism"—continued to exist in a modified form for another decade, until the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. And even now, can we possibly say that many of these structures have already vanished?

Such sociohistorical problems cannot be left unanswered if we want perestroyka to succeed. We must have a clear idea of what aspects of the entire system which developed since the October Revolution should be restructured.

Nor can we avoid moral problems, for a phenomenon such as "Stalinism," related to crimes and tremendous sacrifices, must be reinterpreted and surmounted, and not with the help of reason alone. It is as though we are entering into a moral dialogue with those who lived in the 1930's and after the 1930's, and we try to understand them and, on this basis, gain a better idea of who we are today. We cannot avoid a national repentance which still lies ahead (I am referring not to a one-time ritual but to a moral self-cleansing of every person separately and of society as a whole).

The task of knowing the past fully, in all of its dimensions and contradictions, was formulated in the party documents and voluntarily voiced by the progressive segment of our society. Many social scientists undertook or are undertaking its solution (it is true that, naturally, all of us know that in this sense historians and other social scientists were not in the front ranks, having

substantially yielded primacy to literature, political journalism, cinematography and even painting....). In recent years Marx's favorite aphorism "question everything," consistent with Danton's idea that "mistrust is the highest civic virtue," is being implemented in social science publications with increasing persistence. A great deal of that which previously was taken as a symbol of faith is now being questioned. Following are several examples.

It is usually said that public ownership has been established in our country. But is the form of ownership which we have become accustomed to consider public such in reality? Furthermore, are public and state ownership one and the same?

The elimination of private ownership is considered a most important accomplishment in the development of our society. But was it actually eliminated? How, for example, should we answer L. Karpinskiy, who argues that what we are facing is a rearing private ownership, expressed in terms of ownership of job, a position or a function?....

How can we answer a number of publications by economists, historians and sociologists, who believe that the historically first and most lengthy form of implementation of the idea of socialism was the social system which was established in our country and which was defined by Marx as rough, "barracks socialism"? In the wake of Marx's idea, the authors of such works believe that the domination of universal private ownership over barracks or rough communism is so strong that it tries to destroy anything which no one can own as his private property; hence the total suppression of the individual, efforts to abstract oneself from talent and, as a whole, have at that stage (in this kind of socialism) a society as though embittered by the impossibility of acquiring a personality of its own....

Are T. Zaslavskaya, L. Karpinskiy, A. Butenko and other social scientists right when they claim that in the 1930's what occurred in our country (specifically in terms of the Stalinist type of collectivization) was the alienation of the working person from ownership; as a class, the peasantry was eliminated and the peasants became a variety of state employees, sometimes being paid a salary and sometimes receiving nothing?....

Such and other quests and considerations, one would think, are entirely natural for a normal condition of the society, for the development of the social sciences. To some, however, this natural procedure for acquiring knowledge seems terrifying and the aspiration has appeared in some circles to halt the search for truth, to terminate this process. This is confirmed by statements made by some social scientists, writers and political journalists at conferences (such as the recent meeting of historians and literary workers at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences), and by a number of articles which have come out in the central press.

The most typical and indicative in this respect was the publication of the letter by N. Andreyeva, which was a real political manifesto against perestroyka, based on both the falsifying and dogmatizing of history.

The opponents of perestroyka also have a sharper weapon: the practice of the half-truth. A tremendous need for historical truth has accumulated in society. Most people are attuned to obtaining new information. Under the influence of a misconceived patriotism, some authors assume the stance of defenders of our "great past" which others, they think, insist on "defaming." Such people, in an effort to be in step with the time, are prepared to subject our history to minor cosmetic surgery. For example, in speaking of Trotsky, Zinov'yev and Kamenev they somewhat dilute the impact of the lethal epithets usually applied to them. Naturally, in this case the overall dark background remains unchanged and so is the silence kept on the subject of the most essential processes, facts and events.

Today, for example, Trotsky is no longer considered an agent of foreign intelligence. He did not join the Bolshevik Party to undermine it from within. It turns out that he was even a talented speaker and that he had done something for the revolution in 1917 and during the civil war. This may seem to present a more truthful picture. The essence of these publications, however, is not the desire to reach the truth but the aspiration to preserve in the minds of the Soviet people the image of the "enemy of the people" with the help of a kind of "refined" image of Trotsky. In fact, this is a reproduction of the same old Stalinist system in the evaluation of this political personality which was unusual, in Lenin's view, and was unquestionably more complex than the customary description provided in the "Short Course."

The same is done with Kamenev and Zinov'yev. Like Trotsky, they are described as plotters who tried to do nothing but harm the cause of the October Revolution and the building of socialism in our country. In reality everything was much more complex. We know, for example, that it was precisely Kamenev who most actively and convincingly spoke out against the "April Theses." Yet a motion was made at the April conference to make him a member of the Central Committee. And it was none other than Lenin who made this motion. He substantiated it by saying that usually it is very difficult to convince Kamenev of something and that he always holds onto his own views. The position he holds and his doubts would indicate more clearly the difficulty of persuading, of winning over the social strata and groups represented by Kamenev. That is precisely why he had to be made a member of the Central Committee.

Here is another example. In 1917, after the familiar article by Kamenev and Zinov'yev in NOVAYA ZHIZN, they were removed from active political work. It turns out, however, that Kamenev took part in the 24 October Central Committee session at which he suggested the

creation of a reserve staff for the armed uprising. Following a debate, this suggestion was adopted. This step is mentioned in our publications but the fact that it was made by Kamenev has been kept totally silent, including even in recent publications. All of this is strictly consistent with the Stalinist logic of the perception and interpretation of events, according to which, Kamenev and Zinov'yev, as strike-breakers, could in no way have participated in the work of the Central Committee and made suggestions aimed at the success of the October armed uprising. It is puzzling, at that point, that the day after the armed uprising Kamenev became the first president of the Soviet Republic as chairman of the VTsIK!! It is therefore not accidental that this event in our history was concealed for a number of decades. Yet if we are guided not by Stalin's but by Lenin's logic, everything falls in its place. V.I. Lenin said that Trotsky's non-bolshevism as well as the October event involving Kamenev and Zinov'yev should not be considered as personal charges against them. He interpreted these facts in their biographies as manifestations of the confrontation among different social forces, as a manifestation of the contradictions which occurred in the course of the revolution. He believed that a position held by a political personality should not be explained only in terms of his personal qualities. They must be explained on the basis of the political and social forces represented by such people.

Publications consistent with the spirit of the half-truth present the old false picture of internal political struggle within the party in the 1920's and 1930's. The full Stalinist version of the struggle against deviations remains essentially unchanged and the actual existence of a Stalinist anti-party faction is ignored.

The same could be said on the subject of some works on collectivization (unfortunately, this also includes the articles by V.P. Danilov, a historian who has done a great deal to establish the truth of collectivization and whom I respect profoundly). Some of them cite new previously little known facts and some evaluations are changed. The overall picture which emerges is not as optimistic as the older one. Nonetheless, what emerges is the fact that, as a whole, collectivization was the extension and implementation of the Leninist cooperative plan although in fact, something which once again we know largely thanks to V.P. Danilov, it was something entirely different: The Stalin-type collectivization canceled Lenin's cooperative plan. It became the virtually largest-scale crime committed by the Stalinist regime. Mass punishments were applied for the first time in the course of collectivization. The hunger which was organized in 1932-1933 took millions of human lives. In the course of collectivization, for the first time and again on the largest-possible scale, the Leninist principles of building socialism were perverted: an end was put to the new economic policy, which was the primordial foundation of the building of socialism.

Of late yet another method, an attempt to generate in the social consciousness of the Soviet people some kind of

hybrid image, has appeared and is being developed: a Shchedrin type of symbiosis, consisting of two components: "On the one hand—and on the other hand." On the one hand, mass repressions and crimes; on the other, daily happiness and record-setting. Let there be no aspersion cast on our glorious past!

One could agree with the term "glorious" if one were to add that it came with the sign "plus" and the sign "minus." Indeed Stakhanovite and other records were set (their controversial socio-economic meaning has not been entirely revealed as yet); however, there also was a record in terms of killing one's own people which, it seems to me, has been exceeded only by Pol Pot, in relative but not absolute figures at that. The mathematical component of "on the one hand, and on the other hand," naturally will never contribute to the synthetic comprehension of the past. And, naturally, we would be unable to advance if today we were to lay the entire responsibility for our nationwide misfortune on Stalin alone.

D. Volkogonov has tried to understand the "Stalin phenomenon." In particular, he draws attention to the fact that Stalin was perhaps not entirely sane, that there were some deviations from normality in his character. Some researchers are trying today to prove, at all costs, that Stalin had been an agent of the tsarist secret police. But what is the purpose of all such investigations? We see in them the intention to make Stalin appear as a crafty and mentally sick individual, with low moral and intellectual qualities and with all sorts of sins. It was natural that, as a result, he caused harm; it was natural that he committed crimes and thus darkened the bright image and discredited the idea of socialism. As to the system itself, however, it had nothing to do with it! All of our troubles came from his personal traits.... Many are those who would like to sacrifice Stalin for the sake of saving Stalinism. This also means circumventing the very essence of the problem, bypassing the question of the extent to which Stalin was both the creator and the product of a system which became consolidated under his rule.

I believe that we cannot make any great progress without answering this question and would inevitably return to what marked Khrushchev's sad end. He too believed that we could reject Stalin's legacy either with a pagan act of removing his dust from the Mausoleum or exposing his individual qualities and actions, including those which were criminal. On that level, however, we could understand neither Stalin nor Stalinism and, if we could not understand them we could not surmount them.

Therefore, the objective need exists today, manifested on different levels—party-governmental and scientific-journalistic—to become more profoundly and comprehensively knowledgeable about our past and, thereby, of ourselves, with a view to ensuring the most successful and fullest possible implementation of perestroika. The powerful address delivered by Viktor Astafyev at the

meeting of historians and literary workers on this topic literally made our skin crawl: A person who has experienced a war will not find out about this war from books! And what do those who are now 25 know about it? What would we have known about it had there been no Simonov, Bykov or Adamovich?

But what about the historians? Let us look at the appeal signed by virtually the entire membership of the history department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, headed by academician S. Tikhvinskiy, published in PRAVDA. Why does it look so helpless, so forced?

Other eloquent confirmations of the aspiration of official historical science to avoid a sharp formulation of the question and even of protective tendencies may be found.

Recently MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA published a note by two historians-academics—Yu.S. Kukushkin and B.A. Rybakov—on the subject of textbooks, and the answer of G.A. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education. The academics claimed that there was virtually nothing wrong with the history textbooks used in our schools. The chemist Yagodin, however, spoke of the most important state and party problem, of the trouble with textbooks and the truly most difficult situation in which Soviet history teachers find themselves. For example, the textbook on USSR history for the ninth grade does not include a single unadulterated page. The entire textbook is a lie which the teacher must instill in the young minds. The same applies to VUZ textbooks, particularly those dealing with Soviet history and the history of the CPSU. In recent decades we have virtually not progressed conceptually beyond the range of Stalin's "Short Course of History of the VKP(b)."

It seems to me that if we were to try to answer through joint efforts the question of where is our historical knowledge today best represented, we would reach the conclusion that there is no country in the world in which history has been so falsified as ours. This applies above all to Soviet history, although not to it exclusively. In misrepresenting Soviet history, frequently historians did the same with pre-October history. I believe, however, that it would be entirely wrong to blame the historians alone and to support the myth that our historians are evil. They are not the point or they are not the only point.

We must not forget that the blows which the Stalinist regime inflicted on literature, genetics, cybernetics and other sciences, were inflicted on history as well. We must remember the pogroms which were mounted against the science of history, starting with the case of Tarle and Platonov and ending with the dark period when Trapeznikov and his assistants persecuted Tarnovskiy, Volobuyev and Gechter and for a long time scoffed at Polikarpov.

To surmount Stalinism in our knowledge of history means not only to get rid of ignorance and of authoritarianism in the leadership of this science, which reached the point of petty tyranny. Such difficulties could vanish after Trapeznikov's heirs have left the Central Committee. The main feature of Stalinism, however, is monopoly. Monopoly of one's own vision of history, over new developments in the social sciences, and over first-hand study of a historical source.

We must fill the blank spots in history. We must not only restore and reinterpret it on the level of events but also express it in terms of scientific categories, interpret it historically.

In particular, we should pay attention to the need to historize our past, to deideologize history. It is precisely in this connection, for example, that I have a negative attitude toward the voluminous materials published in PRAVDA under the heading of "Lenin's Testament." It is presented as a talk with our noted historian V.P. Naumov, whom I greatly respect and value. However, I cannot agree with the basic idea of the author of this publication.

In it Lenin is presented as a person who had answers to all questions, who saw the way socialism should be built in all areas. I believe that such was not the case. The publication states that there was a concept of socialism developed by Lenin. It speaks of its fullness and comprehensiveness. It indicates that this concept pertains to the time when it was formulated by Lenin but is also considered suitable for use, ready made, in a distant future. In my view, it would be more accurate to say that in developing the principles of building socialism and considering the constantly changing reality, Lenin, to begin with, did not live under socialism at all but only dreamed and thought that a socialist Russia would come out of the Russia of the NEP. He hoped for this and developed the principles which would govern such a transition.

To us, historians, the question lies also in the following: Was there a Russia of the NEP? Yes, a new economic policy did exist but the question remains open as to whether Russia became the Russia of the NEP. To hope that Lenin had already developed a concept of socialism (not of building it but of socialism) and that all that is left for us is to extract it through scientific procedures out of Lenin's legacy and to implement it under present-day conditions is a delusion. With Lenin's help, relying on the principles governing the building of socialism he developed, we must analyze contemporary reality and develop a modern theory for building socialism and a theory of socialism. On the one hand, such an attitude toward Lenin's legacy would be more accurate, more Leninist; on the other, it would mobilize us more to engage today in active creative quests. Lenin would appear even greater if he is depicted as a person who seeks but does not always find answers to the questions which arise. Such was actually the case.

It seems to me that Lenin's true greatness was manifested precisely in the last years of his life, when he painfully sought and sometimes failed to find answers to the questions which tortured him. Therefore, in the absence of that which I mentioned, in my view the main aspect of Lenin's legacy is lacking.

The question of Lenin's legacy entails a more general question, that of the attitude toward Marxism-Leninism. So far its main features have remained unchanged from the way they were crystallized in the 1930s. It was precisely then that Marxism-Leninism asserted as a quality a dogmatic scholastic ideology which became a hindrance rather than a help in understanding the contemporary world. Suffice it, in order to realize this, to leaf through, once again, our secondary school and VUZ textbooks which enumerate, like a catechism, the five features of imperialism, the 21 points of the transitional period, the five errors made by the Communards, the five socioeconomic systems, etc.

Today we face the quite difficult but unavoidable task of critically reinterpreting Marxism, returning to its foundations, and rejecting the sway of the dogmatists who crushed it in their arms to the point of strangulation. This is necessary above all for the sake of making obvious Marx's thoughts, which remain live and relevant, thoughts about humanism and alienation, i.e., about the "man-labor," "man-nature," and other relations, and of releasing their creative power.

Naturally, 20th century Marxism cannot exist in the aspect in which it existed in the past. This is not only by virtue of the overall laws inherent in the entire intellectual history of mankind. In its essence, Marxism includes its own body of theory, the idea of continuous self-negation. Revision, criticism and negation are absolute within it while preservation is an aspect of relativity. Creative "live Marxism" is a Marxism which is in a state of constant reflection and constant self-criticism. In other words, a state of periodical and systematic self-renovation is inseparable from the essence of Marxism.

We are familiar, for example, with the idea of the three sources and three components of Marxism: German classical philosophy, English political economy and French utopian socialism. But what about the new sources, for all of the ones we named are from the 18th and 19th centuries? Do they, as in the past, remain the fundamental sources of Marxism? Could the question be formulated as follows: The sources of contemporary Marxism are all the most talented and powerful intellectual trends existing in the contemporary world, with the preservation and intensification of the specific characteristics of Marxism.

What is the objective ground for such a steady self-renovation, of restructuring of Marxism? Any form of thinking, in order to remain alive, must constantly exist in a state of dialogue with other systems of thought which develop around us and, thanks to this, be able to

pursue its own continuous enrichment. This is particularly important on the eve of the 3rd millennium, when we are facing a profoundly changed social practice and a new intellectual situation.

To clarify this point let me point out the following:

Marx and Lenin proceeded from two premises in developing the theory of socialism and the victory of the revolution. The first was that capitalism had already played its role. It had already developed its production forces and created the type of relations and political superstructure which could be simply taken over and immediately applied in the development of socialism. History proved to be different in the sense that the condition which was observed by Marx and which Lenin described as the "imperialist stage in the development of capitalism" was, as is now clear, one of the early conditions of capitalism. Naturally, no one, no genius, could predict the postindustrial and post-postindustrial society, the first scientific and technical revolution, the second and the third, the electronic revolution, the atomic, laser, computer and other revolutions and, finally, the revolution in superconductivity which is only now developing or, in other words, the fact that the development of a machine, an industrial production is merely the early, the immature degree of the type of technical progress which was to develop inwards to create havoc, to restructure itself, breaking all previous forms, including that of private capitalism.

The second premise stemmed from the first. Our great teachers thought that they were the contemporaries of the eve and transition to communism. Marx expected communism during his own lifetime. Despite his entire understanding of the complexity and difficulty of the transition, Lenin also considered this transition of being of relatively short duration, taking no more than a few decades. Furthermore, immediately after the Bolsheviks seized the power in 1917, it seemed to them that they could reject market and money and begin to build communism, albeit at that time, war communism. This was not simply a delusion or utopia. It was based on the overestimation of the achievements of capitalism and the prerequisites it had created. It seemed as though not only in a backward country but in any country, and even more so in a developed country everything would go smoothly after the seizure of power. This was not what happened. After the monopoly stage we went through the third and fourth stages of capitalism. The transitional age was, as it turned out, an age during which two systems—capitalism and socialism—coexist, something which was not envisaged at all by the classics. They imagined that one stage would end while a second, the next one, i.e., socialism, would begin. It would begin, possibly, in Russia but subsequently would mandatorily spread throughout the world. It turned out that there would be a coexistence between the two systems, not for a year or two but for an entire historical epoch. This

means that they must engage in a constant dialogue, adapting to each other, reciprocally enriching themselves and competing but not to the detriment but the good of the future.

I think that we must take a different look at the Western world and, in this case, get rid once and for all of the stereotypes which demonize capitalism. The other aspect of such demonizing is the fetishizing of anything achieved in the West or, in more general terms, the mythologizing of the other world, which is nothing but the upside-down image of our official version of ourselves.

Therefore, the old "classical" Marxism, reduced to scholasticism, should be replaced by a live Marxist thinking, intellectually strong and consistently developed and, naturally, in this case it would be useful to weave a modern fabric of a dialogue with Western Marxism or, to put it even better, with Western Marxisms. I am referring above all to Gramsci and the Italian tradition which followed him, the Frankfurt school and the Hungarian Marxists who have developed interesting problems in a variety of, albeit controversial, directions such as, for example, the relationship between the state and society in the contemporary world and, particularly, problems of the political role of the state and the danger of the stratification of society.

I would look at our interrelationship with non-Marxist science as a problem of a general cultural nature. It seems to me that in our attitude toward non-Marxist social science, and in the very contraposition of "we-they," in all of its modifications under the Soviet system, we can see our attitude toward something else in general, toward a different world outlook, a different way of life, etc. This approach will enable us better to understand ourselves, our intellectual self-orientation in the contemporary world and our spirituality. There is no need to point out the importance of all this, when we are taking our initial steps in accordance with the principles of the Delhi Declaration. I hope that the attitude toward others in accordance with these principles, in the area of the social sciences, does not indicate in the least the elimination of boundaries, some kind of eclecticism or absence of principle-mindedness, but the only standard of scientific intercourse possible in our time. This is one of the means of preserving the integrity of the world and its unity, based on differences within it.

We should adopt a serious attitude toward non-Marxist social science, treating it as a science without putting the word in quotation marks. Grounds for such an attitude are provided by the entire history of that science, starting from pre-Marxist times. Naturally, we must argue with it, we must not agree in everything. However, this must be a dialogue among equals, without any self-ascribed beforehand superiority, and without ascribing to non-Marxist social scientists an inherent state of decline. It was as a result of such a biased approach that, starting with the beginning of the 1930's and virtually until very

recently, we remained in a state of intellectual self-isolation. A third generation of Soviet historians is already entering life while remaining, in its majority, ignorant of trends in foreign humanitarian and social thought. This ignorance obscures all basic trends, changes and patterns in foreign social sciences. Adding to this the fact that many of us were trained without having studied a significant portion of our own domestic historical-philosophical legacy, one can imagine the gaps which we must fill.

At the end of the 20th century, in the age of information, when the speed of information turnover and exchange has reached levels inconceivable in the past, no culture can live isolated, nurturing itself alone. That is why today it is becoming essentially important for us to become integrated within the global intellectual society. Naturally, I am not suggesting that we should accept uncritically all that has been generated within the framework of Western culture. However, in order to criticize, which is something we have always done, we must begin by knowing, by studying. The results of such an intellectual quest cannot be predetermined, as we thought, based on a pretentious "scientific nature" of our system of thinking—Stalinized Marxism-Leninism—which, in reality, quite frequently has little in common with Marxism and with science.

The result was that the need of knowing our past, was most strongly expressed by men of arts and literature, and not scientists. The point is that the system which developed during the time when Stalin ran the country, and during the period noted by Brezhnev's social stagnation, history was not needed as a science. At that time it was needed in order to justify the wrong which was being committed. This is an arguable viewpoint but I am convinced that I am right. This, it seems to me, is the reason for the entire falsification of our history. The blank spots in it are like spilled lakes, reflecting the horrible reality of the systematic erasure of the collective memory which may not coincide with that which the regime would have liked to preserve in the official memory. The result of all this is an identity crisis in our contemporary society, for historical memory is the most important, one could say the element which forms a social identity. We look at ourselves in the mirror and cannot recognize ourselves. Images break down into separate fragments. It is precisely within this identity vacuum that space is provided for the life of chauvinistic and anti-Semitic groups such as, for example, the PAM-YAT extremists who, flirting with irrational and easily excitable elements, can offer their own variant of this identity—antihistorical, mythical and racist—anything one may wish. This, however, is a different problem.

That is why I consider the fate of perestroika and of the science of history as inseparably intertwined. In order for the profound restructuring of our society through democratization to succeed and become irreversible, we need the active and conscious participation of all people in this project. We need the young.

In order for history to become a science we must, in particular, abandon once and for all the system of the "Short Course" as far as our domestic history is concerned. Furthermore, we must reinterpret the very concept of "historical truth," which is the cornerstone of present-day philosophy. We must abandon all sorts of claims on the monopoly of historical knowledge. That is why I decisively oppose the writing of a new official history, for currently the writing of a unified textbook on CPSU history is contemplated. What I would like to see is not a kind of new Main Book, but the publication of problem works in which, in addition to a solid factual and information base there would be a variety of hypotheses, ideas and interpretations.

In terms of scientific research, we need a profound methodological renovation. The majority of Soviet historians continue to work ignoring most important trends in contemporary historiography, such as historical anthropology, history of concepts, historical demography, structuralism and hermeneutics. We must launch a serious debate with Western historians who study the history of our country.

Another problem which we must solve with a view to making history a science is that of archives, special

repositories and superspecial repositories. So far, there is no law regulating archive work in our country; there is a draft for such a law, formulated in such a way that access to archives is not broadened but, conversely, made more difficult. I believe that we must set, as is done in all civilized countries, a period of time after which secret documents would become universally accessible. Furthermore, we should solve the question of creating a unified archive fund for the country, which would include the party archives as well. We must also provide broader access to party documents to all researchers. For the time being, party archives are subject to much greater restrictions compared with those of the state.

Naturally, the path which opens in front of us is difficult. However, if we want truly to reorganize our society we must enter this path unhesitatingly: only new historical research, free from ideological dogmas, would help us to interpret in its entirety and hugeness our past, become truly rid of Stalinism and restore our social identity.

Perestroika and the science of history need each other.

05003

**State Moving Toward Normalization of Relations with Church**  
*1800463 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 21 Jun 88 p 3*

[Article by Aleksandr Ignatov, APN political observer: "Socialism and Christianity: New Trends"]

[Text] M. S. Gorbachev receives Pimen, Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church. The journal OGONEK condemns the unjustified repressions suffered during the Stalin era by many priests and hierarchs. Moscow television regularly invites people wearing cassocks to appear. What does it all mean?

The return of "Eternal Rus" to God? A retreat from Marxism or a revision of the party's atheistic positions? Does it mean, in short, the triumph of "the kingdom of God in heaven" over "the earthly paradise" of the Bolsheviks? Or is it "one more attempt," as some have said, "to gloss over reality?" I have another answer: it means a normalization of relations between two worlds which hitherto did not coexist very harmoniously in our society.

The revolution was essentially anathematized by the then head of Russian Orthodoxy, Patriarch Tikhon, although at the time a great number of believers supported the ideals proclaimed by the Bolsheviks. A lot of water has flowed down the Moscow River since then. I think that both the Soviet state and the country's leading church (in terms of the number of cathedrals and adherents), the Orthodox Church, have learned a great deal in the past several decades.

First of all, the Church is now more involved in the social problems reflecting the ideology and policies of Soviet rule. Orthodox theology now takes a different stance toward issues of property, the relationship between the personal and the social, and the very idea of progress. It is no secret that even the "moral code of the builder of communism," as formulated in the party documents of 20 years ago, was by and large acknowledged by the theologians.

Incidentally, the theology of liberation, the various religions' attention to social problems, and the active participation by hierarchs of different confessions in peace efforts all constitute an ecumenical phenomenon which to a large extent owes its birth to October 1917.

And another thing. Justice, freedom, and equality—the ideals of the Bolsheviks—were in harmony with Christian aspirations. The Bolsheviks' self-sacrifice, their personal modesty, and their lack of any striving for personal well-being made the heroes of the revolution close to martyrs for their faith, of whom Orthodoxy has known very many. And, finally, there is today's return to the values of "early Soviet socialism."

It is especially necessary to mention the correction of the crimes, injustices, and errors committed by Soviet rule against Christians. This has been stated unequivocally by K. M. Kharchev, chairman of the Council on Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers. A great deal has already been done since April 1985 in regard to the millions of people among us who, according to sociological surveys, are believers.

It is increasingly more widely understood that no coercion can do away with religious thought. Even now, unfortunately, many local functionaries continue to deal coercively with believers in ways that somewhat remind me of Washington's treatment of communists. K. M. Kharchev has drawn a precise line between religion as a worldview, against which Marxism has always waged an ideological battle, and the Church as a social institution with which the authorities' relations are based on compliance with the law and mutual respect. For in the long run, he emphasizes, the creation of paradise on earth is more important to us than any unity of opinions of the proletarians about a heavenly paradise.

The organization of believers must not be kept separate from processes taking place in society. Especially since the great majority of hierarchs, to say nothing of the believers, actively support perestroika. Today's glasnost offers the people of the Church much greater opportunities; the chairman of the Council on Religious Affairs himself sees "nothing frightening" either in the idea of publishing a religious newspaper (in addition to the journals that already exist), or in believers' forming cooperatives and other associations, the considerable increase in the publication of theological literature, or in the granting of permission to the Church to carry out charity work or conduct lessons in "God's laws" at private or family initiative, outside the framework of the state school system, as was permitted under Lenin.

Inasmuch as we are now focusing so much attention on the human factor and the initiative of every citizen, and are speaking of the necessity of society's active support for such ideals as humaneness, love, mercy, and moral self-perfection, communists are clearly coming to have more in common with Christians.

Soviet rule teaches tolerance in working with people who think differently, is beginning to listen to the clergy, is treating believers more carefully, and is preparing new legislation concerning freedom of conscience and religious associations. The decline of moral values that was observed in our society during the years of Stalinism and the period of stagnation, in my opinion, even requires more active participation by believers in affirming traditional values.

The Christian church's accommodation to the socialist state, although they are separated by law, has already taken place. Today there is an ongoing process of reconciliation between the state and Christianity, between the state and religion in general. There will still be some

flareups of misunderstanding and conflict, obviously, but our society on the whole has recognized the importance of the spiritual world for our believing fellow citizens. Future coexistence between socialism and

Christianity, which by no means rules out civilized ideological struggle, has been given the green light.

06854

**Voznesenskiy Criticism of Khrushchev Challenged**

**Reader Defends Khrushchev**

18000414 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 9 Jun 88 p 6

[Open Letter by A. Kozyrev, Odintsovo, Moscow Oblast: "Be Magnanimous"]

[Text] Dear Andrey Andreyevich! On 26 April, the newspaper published the interview which G. Zhavronkov conducted of you and your book. In the interview there is abuse of N. Khrushchev. This is not the first time that you express such an attitude. Phrases of the type "Khrushchev was our hope," his report at the 20th Congress—"an act of reckless risk and honor" happen to be out of context. You want to show "the anger-distorted face of Khrushchev," who "trusted informers and plotters" and directed "with loud shouting" and "skandezhem" [not further identified] of none other than "his short and pudgy" finger, but his "10-meter portraits adorned the streets." The former Stalin, only expansive, results from what you have said. And if we remember as well that under him there were also prisons (which, by the way, exist and will exist) and people were imprisoned in them, the difference is eroded completely.

The old resentment does not permit you to give N. Khrushchev the assessment which you have let drop, but have not developed in any way: "The main thing is that after 1956 people were freed." This is really the main thing! This is what must be the point of departure in an assessment of N. Khrushchev, if we are to take the large measure of him.

If you had gotten rid of your 25-year long resentment, you would not have said: "The chief went into reverse in politics. . . I heard his speech where Stalin was already praised." It was difficult, but I found 0in my personal archive PRAVDA for 10 March 1963, and I read the speech of N. Khrushchev at the meeting with leading figures in literature and art. (Don't be surprised: In my archive there is also preserved LITERATURNAYA GAZETA for 25 October 1958, in which B. Pasternak's "Doctor Zhivago" was completely crushed in three pages; but now this newspaper is placed together with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA for 25 February 1987, in which you give an interview to Irina Rishina as chairman of the Commission for the Literary Legacy of Pasternak). It is not correct that there, in that speech, they praised Stalin. Read it again. There we read again and again about Lenin's characterization of Stalin, about the violations of the Leninist norms of party life, about Stalin's suspiciousness and persecution mania, about the repressions, about the destruction of tens of thousands of kolkhoz workers at the beginning of the 1930's, etc.

There are, of course, some discussions of the authority, as before there is mention of Bukharin among the opportunists, and the assessments of some works of literature and art, as well as of some figures of this sphere

(Ehrenburg and Yevtushenko, Melnikov and Zhutovskiy, V. Nekrasov and Voznesenskiy, Alabin and Simbirsev) are categorical and rather naive

The spiritual legacy of Stalin is strong even now, after the passage of 35 years after him. But then, in 1963, could N. Khrushchev, as a politician, really not reckon with the real force of the bearers of the former authoritarianism? Could he in those conditions really turn to the intelligentsia? All the more so because it had not yet regenerated itself after the repressions. Was it really for the corn, speaking in your words, that they broke his neck? One must regard as an objective fact that N. Khrushchev genetically carried in himself the attributes of power, in which for decades he developed as a political figure. However, we should give him his due for the inexplicable courage with which he essentially alone went to the rupture with the habitual methods only 3 (!!!) years after Stalin.

In describing the incident, you claim parity with N. Khrushchev. It's the truth, you were then about 30 years old, he was close to 70. You were a young poet, he was the head of the party and the government. In the presence of such distances, he felt in himself the right to have such contact with you—during your performance (yes, yes—this was his weakness). But you refused him this contact publicly, continuing to talk and gesticulate. As an emotional person, he blew up. But forgive him the attack that happened now, after 25 years! Lower yourself to the level on which magnanimity will be your support. All the more so because the old man, a year after the incident, conveyed to you his apology. And for the fact that your mother did not know anything about you for half a year, reproach yourself. You could have scribbled her a couple of words and calmed her in this way.

Those who wish to leave the cult name of Stalin on their banner, have no place in their memory for N. Khrushchev. But you are not with them!

On the correct assessment of the past, the events and persons in it depends the realization of our wishes in the future. This is also a collection of forces

**Voznesenskiy Defends Criticism**

18000414 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 11 Jun 88 p 7

[Reply by Andrey Voznesenskiy: "Reply to My Reader"]

[Text] Dear Comrade A. Kozyrev! Thank you for reading my interview with fragments from the book "Rov" [Ditch] and for addressing a letter to me through the newspaper. I am answering the same day since the same questions torment me, too. I am glad to see that in you a like-minded person, who, citing, shares my basic attitude to N. S. Khrushchev: "Khrushchev was our hope, his report at the 20th Cong., —an act of reckless risk and

courage. . . . The main thing is that after 1956 people were freed. . . ." Indeed, through these great accomplishments N. S. Khrushchev will remain in history.

But you cannot believe that I realistically described during his meeting with the intelligentsia "the anger-distorted face of N. S. Khrushchev, who trusted informers and plotters."

Let us together with you examine three photographs of this meeting. By the way, let us give the reporter his due, who was not afraid to aim his lens at the infuriated head of the state. Look at it yourself. Here is the—by no means by tenderness—distorted face of the premier, here is the glass which I dropped in embarrassment on the rostrum. Let us mentally trade places. Imagine that you are a poet, you whole-heartedly believe in reform, glasnost and approaching democracy, that you "went up on the platform and want to tell what is on your mind, about the situation in literature, believing that he will understand everything." Behind your back is the presidium of comrades-in-arms, selected by him, and you do not yet know that this is the presidium of the future epoch of stagnation. And suddenly you hear the roar: "Mr. Kozyrev, out of our country!" And you, after all, did not ask his pardon. But it is not our modest personages that are at issue.

I believe that you will subscribe to my feeling: "For a long time I could not comprehend how both the good hopes of the 1960's, the powerful threatening gesture of reforms, and the petty tyranny of a merchant, were combined in one person."

You write that the head of state "felt in himself the right to such contact with you," you call this "contact"—and the shout from the rostrum at the artist I. Golitsyn: "Man with spectacles!", and the yelling in the Manezh at the artists, and the stampeding at the fragile M. Aliger, the public humiliation of people, and their crushing. I believe, not only the head of a world power, but also the instructor of a raskom hardly has the right to such contacts.

I shall repeat myself, but I believe that one of the mistakes of N. S. Khrushchev was his distrust of and hostility to the intelligentsia, the creative role of which in glasnost is obvious now. Not being strong in culture, he trusted informers and envious persons from literature (which he regretted when he was in retirement) and sanctioned the persecution of Pasternak. You are an objectivist, you put together a clipping with the pogrom articles about Pasternak together with my article against these pogroms. Is it possible that your heart did not freeze over the broken fate of B. Pasternak, over the fact that V. Dudintsev suffered an infarction as the result of unjust criticism, over the persecution of A. Yashin, the author of the well-known "Rychagi", did you really not feel pain for the fate of V. Grossman, and for the young artists crushed by "the contacts"? I am not thinking about magnanimity, but about compassion, is it possible

that your soul did not grieve for them? In the same issue of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, it is printed above your letter that N. S. Khrushchev did not answer the desperate appeal of Kazakevich to publish his essay against Stalinism. Remember the orchestrated respite at the writers' meeting which demanded the exile of deportation of Pasternak. A prose writer shouted: "Out of our country, Mr. Pasternak!" A critic repeated: "What are we to do with Mr. Pasternak?" He should not be registered among the population of the USSR." A powerful poet concluded his speech: "Out of the country!" Probably, out of inertia, these formulations were also repeated by N. S. Khrushchev at the indicated meeting in the Kremlin. The blame for them lies "on the literary public" brought up by Zhdanov.

In answer to my phrase that Khrushchev "at that time went into reverse in politics and praised Stalin," you categorically conclude: "This is not correct." And you refer to PRAVDA with Khrushchev's speech, where he supposedly only spoke about Stalin—about the authority of the butcher, perhaps? Alas, you do not know, during this epoch of flattery and anti-glasnost, half of his words did not turn up in the newspapers, as these three photographs also did not make it into the paper, nor his monologues against the artists and writers: "Out of the country!" There were only reports about the cordiality of the meetings.

Moreover, here is his published statement when he went into reverse in politics: "As a dedicated Leninist-Marxist and staunch revolutionaries, Stalin will occupy a prominent place in history." With this he cancelled out his speech at the 20th Congress.

For some reason, you did not support the proposal advanced in my interview that the speech at the 20th Congress should be published. This is another weakness of Khrushchev. It seems to me that he did not decide on glasnost, but he permitted only himself to criticize Stalin's shortcomings, and only within the circle of the highest party elite, not trusting democracy. The poet B. Slutskiy, who wrote anti-Stalin poems, as the result of persecution ended up in a psychiatric hospital. They utilized "the opinion of the people" only in order to destroy, "in accordance with the will of the workers," the payments on the loan bonds. In this lies the tragedy of the great figure of Khrushchev, the reformer and fighter for peace, who at times was unable to conquer the Stalinist in himself to the end. Ehrenburg remembered the words of Khrushchev: "In questions of art, I am a Stalinist." But is it really possible to be a Stalinist in literature and ideology and become a reformer in the economy?

I am not a historian. I simply described an episode. I described everything as it was. I advise you to read the research of F. Burlatskiy on Khrushchev and the memoirs of A. Adzhubey, who loved him and knew him very well. He testifies: ". . . behind the seeming lack of restraint there was perceptible a subtle and at times even

cunning calculation. . . . But what was, was. They told Khrushchev repeatedly that Vladimir Dudintsev, in the novel 'Not by Bread Alone', wrote precisely about the negative phenomena which he, Khrushchev, is criticizing, but this did not change his negative attitude to the book. Incomprehensible? When the sculptor Ernest Neizvesinny conceived a monument to N. S. Khrushchev in Novodevichiy Cemetery, he combined white and black stone in it. . . ."

As you correctly write, "He genetically carried in himself the attributes of power in which he took up position as a political figure." That is, he was dominated by his past and participation, he constantly repressed the Stalinist in himself, the "black stone." For all of this, Stalin is also responsible, for the black stone is the handiwork of his system. Resentments to Khrushchev, as you understand, I did not have. There was a shock from the unjustified hopes for the democratization that had begun, there was pain. Always, even in my most terrible troubles, I understood the great thing that he did for our people. Already many years ago I said that "I do not bear him evil. The main thing is that in 1956 people were released." ("Rov", p. 213).

But the lesson of the tragic experience of Khrushchev should be understood in our life today and our future life so as the current struggle for democratization does not get bogged down. Why, having taken the great step of liberation, did he not succeed, after all, in conquering the resistance of the bureaucracy and the dark forces? This is the question. In many respects he was destroyed by flatterers of the type of Podgorny, the type of the creators of the film "Nash Nikita Sergeyevich" [Our Nikita Sergeyevich]. For the flatterers, he personally authorized Lenin prizes in literature for the description of his trips. His environment, having developed his petty tyranny, weakened him in the holy struggle. They, as well as you, illuminated in him only the "white stone" and through this they helped advance the black swelling which destroyed his mighty nature. Through this they killed in him the reformer.

The people needs to know the entire truth, in all details, however irritating they might be. The episode I have told is but a point of the gigantic mosaic of Khrushchev's portrait. Fragments of the "black stone" are visible in these three photographs.

We remember all the good and the great that was carried out by N. S. Khrushchev, but we should carefully analyze where "the black stone" destroyed him, why the first attempt at restructuring perished—so that the restructuring of today does not perish. For, as is well known, there will be no third restructuring.

"On the correct assessment of the past, the events and persons in it, depends the realization of our wishes in the future"—with these important words I completely agree.

### Authors New Rights To Publish At Own Expense Questioned

#### Benefits Seen As 'Fiction'

18000459 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 4 Jun 88 p 7

[Article by Genrich Gunn: "Same Old Song"]  
[Text] Finally, we have received our copy of the "Regulation concerning procedures for publishing books at the author's expense" (KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE No 16) from Goskomizdat. This "Regulation" deserves a place in the annals as a classic example of a widely proclaimed right being turned inside out and transformed into a fiction.

Under what conditions would an author want to publish a book at his own expense? This occurs most frequently when his work, for one reason or another, does not find its way into the publishing system. For example, the publishing plan is "full up" for several years in advance. Or a satisfactory relationship is not established with a publishing house. Or the author is afraid of the arbitrary power of the editor, real or imagined. Considering his work to be artistically and ideologically sound, the author (we are speaking here about a professional and not a hack) wants to go directly to the reader, bypassing our monstrously cumbersome editorial and publishing system. This is what he wants and, from now on, he will be able to do it.

However, according to the "Regulation," the author must continue to deal with a publishing house! The author's hopes that, by publishing a book "at his own expense," he will succeed in buying freedom from editorial and publishing supervision are vain. Quite the opposite; the Goskomizdat has put him in the most dismal position: now he will actually have to pay for being supervised.

"A book published at the author's expense" must traverse the following route: the author brings the manuscript to the publishing house (as he always did), it will be considered (like any manuscript), approved (or disapproved), and included in the plan. Next the manuscript is subjected to routine editorial processing. The only new element in this process is the fact that the proud author "at his own expense" must pay for the consultation, reviewing, and editing (and of course printing expenses) that are free for the "usual" author. In addition the size of the edition printed must not exceed 3000 copies, which, at best, will barely pay for expenses. But in addition to paying all publishing and printing expenses, the author must give an additional 20 percent of his future revenue to the publishing house, which has benevolently deigned to do business with him. The only consolation the hapless author has is the promise to publish his "at the author's expense book" within a year, rather than the usual two or three years.

I confess that not only don't I see anything new or restructured in the "Regulation," but I can't even find anything which accords with common sense.

The publication of a manuscript continues to lie completely in the power of the publishing house. What is so new about that?

By the way, a most paradoxical situation arises. If the publishing house approves a manuscript, deeming it worthy, then what is the sense of publishing the book in a small edition, and obtaining a wretched pittance from the author-one-man publisher? Would it not be simpler to enter into the traditional contractual relationship with that same author? Thus, in the final analysis, everything returns to the old way things were done in the wonderful time of stagnation.

The issue is extremely simple: either the publication of a book at the author's expense must be independent of the publishing house, or it must not exist at all. As they say, what is extra comes from the devil, and this is the case with the Goskomizdat "Regulation."

#### Text of New Regulations

18000459 Moscow KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian 15 Apr 88 p 2

[*"Regulation Concerning The System For Publishing Books At The Author's Expense: Passed by the USSR Goskomizdat"*]

[Text] In order to further democratize book publishing, encourage new authors to create original works, and speed up the process through which they are published procedures for publishing books at the author's expense are established.

The manuscripts of such books must not contain material at variance with Soviet legislation, USSR interests, or go counter to the goals of safeguarding state secrets from print.

1. The author is granted the right to publish his own work through publication at his own expense. The publishing house is obliged to accept manuscripts from authors appropriate to the type of literature they publish, consider them, and decide whether they are suitable for publication with no subsidy.

2. Authors may publish at their own expense new works on artistic, social-political, and scientific-technological topics. When the decision is made about publishing works, preference will be given to authors who have not yet published.

3. Responsibility for the ideological, artistic, and scientific content of the books published at the author's expense will lie primarily with the author.

4. Publication of books at the author's expense will be based on a contract concluded between the author and the publishing house, which will stipulate: the responsibilities of both parties, the types of services the author will receive (consultation, literary and technical editing, typing, artistic and graphic formatting, proofreading, preparation of a make-up copy, printing of the edition, etc.); the deadline for producing the edition, the retail price of the book, the total amount to be spent in production of the book, for which the author will reimburse the publishing house (in accordance with preliminary calculations after signing of the contract, followed by final calculations after publication), the distribution system for the book, and other conditions.

5. An author will not be paid the usual fee for books published at his own expense.

6. Orders for publication of a book published at the author's expense will be placed by the publishing houses with printing enterprises in accordance with established procedures. The author may propose a printer for filling his order on the basis of preliminary negotiations with a printing shop. Transactions will take place through the publishing house.

7. The size of the edition of books published at their author's expense will be established to accord with the capabilities of the publishing house, but will not exceed 3000 copies.

8. Books published at their author's expense and meeting with public recognition and demand may be reprinted by the publishing house on the usual basis with the author receiving payment as if this were a first edition.

9. For services rendered, the author will compensate the publishing house for all expenses plus a profit (revenue) of 20 percent of the total of actual expenses. The time required to publish a book at the author's expense will not exceed one year.

If the author requests a rush order, he must pay at a higher rate which will be stipulated by agreement between the parties.

Paper and other necessary materials at the disposal of the publishing house and printer will be used for publication of books at the author's expense.

10. Books published at the author's expense are his property and he may decide if they are to be sold independently or through the book store network. In the latter case, the book selling organizations are obliged to provide services to the author for the distribution of his books.

When books are sold by a book selling organization, the author will reimburse them for expenses connected with their sale in accordance with an agreement between the parties. Distribution of control and required copies will take place in accordance with established procedures.

11. Retail prices for books published at the author's expense will be established through agreement with him or will be based on the current price list.

12. It shall say on the reverse side of the title page: "This edition was produced at the author's expense," and the copyright will be recorded on the lower portion of this page by means of a copyright symbol, the name of the author, and the year of publication.

13. The publishing house will list books published at their authors' expense on form No 1, "Report on publication and submission for printing," on a separate line, and will include recompense for publishing services in its report of provision of remunerated services to the population.

From the resources obtained for providing editorial and printing services to the author, the publishing house will reimburse the printing enterprise for expenses incurred in printing, which the latter will include as part of the remunerated services it provided to the population.

The revenue thus received may, with the agreement of the Workers' Council, be used to provide incentives for workers of the publishing house and printing enterprise.

14. The book-selling organizations will include information on sales of editions published at their authors' expense in its retail sales turnover and this will be reflected in its statistical reporting documents.

15. Issues related to relinquishing rights for reprinting abroad booksthat were first published in the USSR at their authors' expense will be decided by the All-Union Agency for Authors' Rights in accordance with established procedures.

From the editors: Dear comrade readers! The editors received a great number of responses to the publication of the draft resolution of the USSR Goskomizdat concerning publication of books at the author's expense (KO No 2). The remarks and suggestions contained in the letters were forwarded to the working commission for analysis and many of them were considered in the preparation of the present "Regulation..."

The editors express sincere gratitude to all those who, through their letters, participated in the discussion of the draft.

### **UkSSR Writers' Union Chief Argues for Freedom of Choice in Language Study**

18000343 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 17 May 88 p 6

[Excerpts from article by Yuriy Mushketik, First Secretary of the UkSSR Writers' Union Administration, Kiev: "The Friendship of the Peoples Is Not an Empty Word"]

[Text] It seems that we have stopped noticing by now what a great thing it is to be able to discuss everything openly: the society is being cleansed of alien influences and is returning to Leninist ideas and standards, in particular, to the Leninist idea of internationalism, or the friendship of the peoples.

We have a proverb in the Ukraine: in the pail of the past you will not be able to see either the present or the future. For some reason some historians, when they describe the sources of friendship of the Slavic peoples, often seem ready to stand on tiptoe only to reach respectfully the czar's crown. Some time in the late 1930's, a movement began to revive the worst traditions of Russian statehood, and Lenin's words describing old Russia as "the prison of nations" from which they were delivered only by the Great October Revolution were completely forgotten. Such extremely important aspects of history as the bond between the poor of the Don and the Zapozhye regions have not been highlighted in these so-called historical opuses—even though no important revolt on the Don, neither Bolotnikov's, nor Razin's, nor Pugachev's, occurred without the participation of thousands of average Ukrainian laborers.

The Russian culture and the Russian literature are our conduit to world culture. The Russian language is our multinational ambassador.

Let us not forget that the bridges of friendship in our literature were built by such titans of the spirit as Maksim Gorkiy, Pablo Tychina, Nikolai Tikhonov, Leonid Leonov, Yanka Kupala, Andrey Upit, Mukhtar Auezov, Abulkasim Lakhuti, Samed Vurgun, and Avetik Isaakyan. Today, these bridges are being used by thousands of writers to get to know each other. We are also building new bridges, to make our ties stronger and closer and newly enlarge and deepen our relationship with writers of all Soviet republics. This involves both translating and publishing the books. This means the 50 volumes of the "Sources of Friendship" book series, such series as "The Treasury of Fraternal Writings," "The Nation's Young Poets" and "Brotherhood," as well as many other exhaustive series and anthologies.

Kiev currently has a Friendship of the Nationalities library, and soon a cultural center of the nationalities will open. Today, we pay much attention to the questions of creative development and publishing possibilities for writers living in the Ukraine who write in Russian, Yiddish, Moldavian and Hungarian.

However, people who think that internationalism is bestowed on them by nature, that they imbibe it with the mother's milk, are wrong. It is a feeling that must be acquired, and sometimes it has to be fought for.

An example of how important it is to take into consideration all the aspects of the nationalities problem may be the situation in Nagorno Karabakh and thereabout. It is only natural that those troubling events echoed not only in the hearts of Armenians and Azerbaijanis, but of every true Soviet living in our wonderful motherland.

I would like to touch on but one aspect of this problem. We say that each nationality is talented in its own way, and has its own way of life—and we see that ourselves. We also know that each tongue is beautiful and rich in its own way, and that the tongues develop and become richer primarily in contact and interconnecting with one another. Yet, you will agree that we know this more in general terms, or as a theory.

Naturally, we all have a sense of humor and like jokes. Yet, when in Kiev, a shop sign "Perukarnya" is laughed at by tourists from the neighboring republics who think that it is somehow funny and not euphonious enough compared to the Russian equivalent for barber shop, it is nothing but an insulting lack of culture. Young people laugh at it, high school students, and their teachers who stand beside them also laugh. There is no one there to explain to them that the word "peruka" appeared in Old Russian and Slavonic alongside such words as "stately," or "supreme." I would also like to point out that this kind of humor is tantamount to illiteracy in general, lack of understanding of the beauty of one's native tongue and ignorance of history, and that it is the direct result of poor teaching at school. This is where all those "kaif," "shans" and "fiasko" come from. And also slang words such as "vodila," "tachka," "shmanai," "pushchak," "baldei," "marafet" and so on, and so forth. The cult of this lack of individuality is another consequence of the weakening of the struggle for linguistic purity of the Russian as well as Ukrainian tongues.

Just like those young men laugh at words of a closely related language, so poorly educated toughs at my village used to laugh at the Belorussian speech patterns of boys and girls tossed to our region by the war. They also pronounced some Ukrainian words incorrectly. In particular, my classmates used to laugh at one girl, who wore a hat with tassels. Later that girl grew up, got married and now her children are perfectly fluent in both languages. It so happened that the language they speak at home is Ukrainian. The family, however, soon came up against some difficulties: the Ukrainian school which her little kids were attending was closed down. They would have to commute far away, by trolley and with a transfer; the kids would have to be taken there by the parents who were both in a hurry to get to work. Together with other parents, both Ukrainian and Russian, they went to the District Department of Education and asked to keep the school open. It happened to be Kiev School No. 92.

which famous scientists such as Agafangel Krymskiy, the specialist in Eastern culture, M.Dray-Khmara, M.Kalinovich, P.Navrotskiy, and dozens of others, including Vitaliy Korotich, attended in their time. The school was the city's pride, but no one took this into consideration. "It was done at the request of parents," they were told. But such parents were a minority many times smaller in number. That was the one minor detail that had slipped the bureaucrats' minds. As a result, at schools where the native tongue becomes an elective subject we observe a sad situation. In the native tongue classroom there are, say, 20 students who have to take the subject and 15 who don't. The latter spend their time, at best, playing sea-battles, chess or dominoes, which of course undermines classroom discipline. The strange fact is that parents most likely to ask that their kids be released from studying the republic's language are those who have very low education themselves. Some even procure letters from psychiatrists, doctors who treat injuries, and opticians. Obviously, this situation cannot be considered normal at a civilized country. In the Ukraine, as well as in Belorussia, such an approach goes against the very spirit of the common ancestry and the unbreakable bond of the fraternal Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian nations, which all three have sprung up from a common historical root.

Problems engendered by the law guaranteeing the parents' right to choose the language in which their children would be educated also turned out to be serious. In the Ukraine, this law is used primarily by pragmatic philistines; they base their conclusions on the fact that the use of Ukrainian in the courts, public transportation, colleges, social work and management has been on the decline. In recent years, the centralized management methods have been based on different principles altogether. Now, in a number of cities in the Ukraine, such as Donetsk, Zhdanov, Zaporozhye, Chernigov and Kharkov, there are no Ukrainian schools left, or there are 2 or 3 at the most. Here, for instance, what happens to Ukrainian language education in the Dnepropetrovsk oblast: In Nikopol, there are 17 Russian language schools and 1 each Ukrainian and mixed school; in Pavlograd 26, 1 and 1 and in Dnepropetrovsk 116, 9 and 15, respectively. In less than ten years, from 1978 to 1987, the number of Ukrainian schools in the oblast fell from 631 to 556.

Without casting doubt on the democratic principles underlying the law of the parents' free choice of the language in which their children are educated, we nonetheless cannot help wondering how under the circumstances described above one can speak of a free choice?

While the kids forget their native mother culture, they become familiar with the most superficial levels of another language and another culture. How can they, deprived as they are of their own roots, enrich the Russian cultural memory? I understand the concern expressed by Russian cultural figures over the loss on the part of some people of their historical national memory.

as well as over the dilution and thinning out of the Russian language and Russian culture in general. This concern is often compelling and multifaceted, just as the arguments among intellectuals working with the Russian language and culture have been complex and acute. And there are many reasons for this. Recently, at the meeting of the administrative body of the republic Writers' Union, we, Ukrainian writers, heard the reports of writers working in Rumelian Greek. They are the Greeks, originally from the Black Sea region, who now live mainly in the Donetsk oblast. Their language is interesting only because it is extremely close to the language of Homer and Pericles. Before the war, Donetsk Greeks had their own schools, a theater, a newspaper, an almanac and a magazine. Nine writers worked in the language. In 1937, all those writers were arrested and the schools and the publications were shut down. Years have passed, and the situation has changed; the majority of

the population now knows the native tongue; yet, there is no one to study it at school. Rumelian writers have to translate their own work into Russian and Ukrainian.

The same situation, except in a slightly different context, exists in the languages of some other nationalities. As Eduard Belov correctly wrote in his article in the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA issue dated December 23, 1987: "We stubbornly close our eyes to the fact that the literature of many minor nationalities in our country is quite far from the state of prosperity that official literary criticism ascribes to it." Here again, the same interconnection exists: the respect for a language can grow if works of literature are created in it that provide spiritual nourishment to the people or provide answers to important questions.

12892

**Sociologists Hold Impromptu Roundtable on NKAO Issues**  
*18300292 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian*  
*9 Jun 88 p 4*

[Interview with Professor L. Karapetyan, doctor of philosophical sciences, chairman of the Armenian division of the Soviet Sociological Association of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by A. Brtyan in Suzdal, date not specified: "Sociology and Interethnic Relations"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] The board of the Soviet Sociological Association (SSA) of the USSR Academy of Sciences (AS USSR) held a plenary meeting in the ancient Russian city of Suzdal; the participants included the members of the SSA board, prominent sociologists and social psychologists, representatives from the CPSU Central Committee, from the AUCCTU and from various ministries and departments.

Professor L. Karapetyan, doctor of philosophical sciences, chairman of the SSA Armenian division, pro-rector of the Yerevan State University (YSU), and L. Arutyunyan, doctor of philosophical sciences, member of the division buro, and head of the department of applied sociology at YSU, participated in the work of the plenum. We bring to the attention of our readers an interview with L. Karapetyan.

[Question] Lyudvig Mnatsakanovich, recently the various strata of the public in our republic and other regions of the country have focussed their attention on the events taking place in Nagornyy Karabakh, as well as on the issues and commentaries arising from these events. How and in what measure were these questions discussed at the SSA plenum?

[Answer] The program for the Suzdal forum of sociologists did not call for a discussion of the NKAO (Nagornyy Karabakh Autonomous Oblast) problems, but the forum could not fail to address the painful question disturbing our community. The events taking place in Nagornyy Karabakh and surrounding it are also socio-political in nature; they are of professional interest to sociologists as a phenomenon which can help us to understand the moving forces and tendencies in the development of national processes, as well as their essence and character, and to achieve the difficult path of resolving conflict situations.

In the current period of perestroika the following questions of a sociological nature have been posed with particular urgency: what kind of role is emerging for the people in the process of perestroika? Does perestroika have a national face or a sociological memory, what is that memory's role in perestroika, etc. These questions fitted in well with the agenda of the plenum. We, the representatives of the Armenian division of the SSA, considered it our obligation to present objectively to our colleagues the history and the essence of the events taking place. And no one in the hall where the plenum

took place remained indifferent to this question. The anguish over the Sumgait tragedy has been felt by all honest people in our country, regardless of their nationality or place of residence.

In the evening prominent specialists in the area of sociology and social psychology participated in a round table discussion, the purpose of which was to give a social diagnosis of the events taking place in the NKAO, Yerevan and Sumgait, and to propose methods to eliminate tension in the relations between the two neighboring republics. The round table was fruitful; a diagnosis of the events which had taken place was provided, and the work of the mass information media was evaluated. Methods of effective action were worked out in line with the situation, as were questions concerning the need to apply socio-technical methods for eliminating the accumulated social alienation. Among those who spoke were professors M. Toshchenko, G. Andreyev, L. Gordon, N. Lapin, B. Firsov, O. Shkaratan, V. Yadov and others.

[Question] That is interesting, but what kind of decisions did the plenum take on these questions?

[Answer] From a social viewpoint the plenum, while following the situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia with regard to the NKAO events, expressed concern over the worsening of interethnic relations and the violence in Sumgait which arose as a result.

The plenum passed a resolution approving the activities of the SSA's Armenian division—given the events which developed—in the study of new sociological processes and phenomena; at the same time it considered that the Azerbaijani and Armenian sociologists have a professional obligation to discover the developing trends in interethnic relations, to carry out a series of sociological investigations for the purpose of normalizing the situation in this region of the country and to determine sociological criteria. The plenum decided to recommend to the board president of the SSA AS USSR and the central scientific-research divisions that they give direct assistance to the sociologists of Armenia and Azerbaijan in this very important work.

[Question] We also know that the plenum adopted an appeal directed to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Please tell us about it in a few words.

[Answer] The appeal was formulated on the basis of the discussion about the questions aired at the plenum. In it the sociologists expressed their concern about the problems in the NKAO and the events in Azerbaijan and Armenia; it was noted that under the conditions which developed the mass information media did not succeed in carrying out their tasks at the necessary level. A desire was expressed for broad coverage of the normalization of the situation, the course of the legal proceedings for the abominable crimes committed in Sumgait, which were not only hooliganistic but also nationalistic in nature. At

the same time the hope was expressed that the publication of materials on the Sumgait proceedings and their results will become an exceptionally important means of dissociating the people from any form of nationalism; it was noted that concealing the truth is dangerous and may affect the prestige of the party adversely.

[Question] Tell me, please, have you recently had any research concerning questions of interethnic relations?

[Answer] Yes, we have. The institutes of ethnography, philosophy and law, history and a number of other scientific-research institutes of the republic's academy of sciences have been conducting research of this kind for many years.

In closing, I wish to add the following: all kinds of fabrications and rumors continue to surround the Karabakh problems, and unfortunately, they are sometimes provocative. For this reason it is essential for the young people, and especially students, to show restraint, to be sure they are on the right track, and to avoid taking ill-considered steps.

In my opinion the mass media even now are not being effective enough in their coverage of the problems related to the NKAO, the Sumgait refugees, the events which are unfolding at present and the work being carried out in the country with regard to these questions. And without this kind of coverage it is difficult to achieve the restraint and objectivity so necessary on this question.

8543

#### Procuracy Officials Want Better Criminal Investigators

1800454a Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 23,  
6-12 Jun 88 pp 16-17

[Article by Kirill Stolyarov, under rubric "Beyond the Threshold of Professional Secrecy": "Who Will Help the Investigator? Success in the Restructuring of Society is Inconceivable Without the Reinforcement of Social Legality"]

[Text] As was noted in the recently enacted resolution of the CPSU Central Committee, entitled "The State of the Fight Against Crime, and Additional Steps to Prevent Offenses," the agencies of internal affairs, the procuracy, justice, and the court are still moving slowly to reorganize their activities, as has been attested to by the large number of letters concerning the poor work of the militia and the investigative apparatus and concerning the lack of the proper protection of the personal and property rights of Soviet citizens.

How does one explain this? Are we really to believe that it can be explained only by the inertia and sluggishness of officials? Certainly not, if the matter rested only upon cadre reassessments, of which, obviously, there has not

been any shortage lately, then, I assume, everything would be much simpler than the situation that actually prevails. The main problem, it seems to me, lies elsewhere—there are economic, organizational, and social problems that go beyond the confines of the rights and powers of those who head individual sectors of law-enforcement work and even entire departments, and that require resolution on a nationwide level. It is on precisely those problems that I want to concentrate my attention.

The purpose of this article is to familiarize the readers with the state of affairs in the work of the investigative agencies, with those still unresolved questions that cannot fail to cause unrest and serious concern in us.

I hasten to make the stipulation: my comments have absolutely no claim to being all-embracing and deal only with investigation in the procuracy system, where, as is well known, almost all the most serious crimes are investigated. In addition, I shall limit myself to making comments and will give the floor to professionals who took part in the conference of workers at the city and rayon level, which was recently conducted by the USSR Procuracy, thus enabling them to discuss ways in which to improve the work style, to increase the return on the work performed by everyone, to guarantee the unity of legality in the country, and to increase among the population the respect for the law.

And so we give the floor first to Vladimir Ivanovich Kalinichenko, senior investigator for especially important cases, under USSR Procurator, state counsellor of justice 3rd class: One cannot fail to direct attention to the fact that there currently exists a rather large number of investigators who see the resolution of the problems of crime in making the punishment harsher. I remember when we people at the investigation unit of the USSR Procuracy were sent various items that had been confiscated during searches conducted on people under investigation: imported radio and video apparatus, jewelry, and other valuables. You can imagine my surprise when one of the investigators, upon seeing these items, stated angrily, "They ought to be shot without a trial or an investigation!"

Incidentally, the people to whom the valuables belonged had worked a long time abroad, and by no means everything that they had accumulated had been obtained as unjust profit. Moreover, whatever a person has done, he is still a citizen of our country and thus he has the right to have his crime carefully analyzed. My associate, who had temporarily forgotten his objectivity, had already prejudged the nature of the crime at the very beginning of the investigation...

Humanitarianism and spiritual delicacy are derivatives of human culture, rather than being the result of irreproachable social origin. Because who among us is accepted into legal institutions? There is a competition there not of knowledge, but of questionnaires!

I used to know a poorly trained, worthless investigator. All his coworkers had problems with him. Previously he had been a highly skilled lathe operator, a communist labor shock worker, but what had he then become?... I do not know who came up with the idea that real investigators must invariably be people who have previously worked in labor collectives, but if the applicant is a party member, then three threes on the entrance examinations guarantee him a place in a legal institute.

We have outstanding investigators with a labor biography. This is a fact, but the completely value training of a future legal worker cannot be replaced by a personnel-actions list that is convenient for statistics. Life assigns everyone to his proper place. Out of almost 400 persons who graduated with me from Kharkov Legal Institute in 1971, only a few dozen continued to work in the procuracy or the court.

**Aleksandr Vasilyevich Frolov, deputy chief of the investigative unit of USSR Procuracy, senior counsellor justice:** The procuracy agencies have capable young people who, with the passage of time, develop into first-rate investigators. But I agree completely with Vladimir Ivanovich—the abundance of mediocrity is simply depressing. The general procurator stated bitterly, "The specialists are transferring out!" Without a sense of honor, without high-principledness, without thorough professional knowledge in combination with overall culture, a person will never become an investigator.

**Sergey Markyanovich Vinokurov, procurator of Minskii Rayon, Kiev, counsellor of justice:** That is not enough. We definitely need another property that is called different names—talent, vocation, or, if you wish, a gift of God... But we promote a person to the position of investigator without any special analysis—after the young specialist has completed his probationary work, a certification commission decides everything depending on the availability of a particular job billet.

A particular place needs, for example, an assistant procurator. A person is sent there. If an investigator is needed, they make him an investigator. The person begins working, he acquires various work skills, and little by little he develops into what we call a "formalizer of criminal cases." But does he have the right to predetermine people's fate? Does he have enough data for that purpose? Is he a professional?

**A. Frolov:** The "questionnaire" investigator is, of course, a calamity—you cannot put it any other way. For us, work with persons under investigation is, in a certain sense, a contest, a confrontation of minds, will, and intellect. But what are the actions of those investigators who, to put it mildly, are not rich in those areas? They put the emphasis on their inner conviction that the person under investigation is guilty, instead of on collecting the objective proof, and, as the General Procurator often says, they go not from the crime to the person, but, on the contrary, from the person to the crime.

Hence, as you can guess, the unsubstantiated arrests, the bringing of innocent people to criminal responsibility, lives that have been shattered for absolutely no reason...

I have repeatedly noticed that, the less cultured or, so to speak, more ignorant that a person is, the greater his assurance. Limited people usually do not have any doubts. Everything is immediately obvious to them, whereas a real investigator is required to doubt. Otherwise the presumption of innocence has a low price on it.

[Question by K. Stolyarov:] So far as I understand, the institutes do not give any special training in investigative work, isn't that so? Where, then, does an investigator begin?

**V. Kalinichenko:** With the Japanese method of teaching people how to swim. They throw you in the water, and then... I began as an ordinary investigator in a rayon procuracy in Zaporozhye, and, speaking frankly, I was lucky. I don't know how I would have turned out if it had not been for Aleksey Petrovich Gorobiyevskiy, a very experienced worker in procurator investigation and an unusually kind-hearted person.

Our offices were situated next to one another, and in the evening, after work, he would call me into his office and patiently guide me onto the true path: "Volodya" he would say, "this has to be done in such-and-such a way, but that has to be done in a completely different way..." No one assigned Aleksey Petrovich to work with me. He probably felt this to be his moral duty...

And we had to work under very difficult conditions. You are investigating, say, a recently discovered murder that had occurred two weeks previously. You arrive at the scene of the crime, and the stench there is beyond words. You would sit for five or six hours alongside the decomposed body in which white worms—maggots—were crawling. You would prepare the documentation that was required for that type of crime, and then you would collect those worms into a test tube—laboratory tests on them would subsequently establish the time of death. You would return home late at night and, unbeknownst to your wife, you would put that test tube in the refrigerator because you had no other place to put it until morning.

The next day you would go to the procuracy, and there you would see a corridor full of witnesses. You would interrogate them one after the other. You would write and write, and by the end of the day your head would be leaden, your eyes could not differentiate anything, the only thing you wanted to do was to go to sleep...

**A. Frolov:** I remember my first steps and I come to the conclusion that very little has changed since then, but if it has indeed changed, it has been for the worse. The investigators at the rayon procuracies—and not only the rayon ones—are jammed together, with several people in a single room. Just try to talk to a victim who had been

raped the day before, while right next to you, perhaps a meter away, another investigator is typing by the "hunt and peck" method on a typewriter, a third is interrogating a person suspected of bribery...

The investigator has been given the complete responsibility for uncovering the crime. The established deadlines are rigid, and those who are legally obliged to work for the investigator act as though they are doing him a favor, or simply said that they cannot do it because they are too busy.

It is very difficult, for example, to find transport to remove a body from the scene of the crime. There have been frequent instances when the investigator waits until late at night until a jeep arrives. There is no one to carry the body. The driver states in an insulted tone, "It's not my job!" So the investigator himself carries the body and puts it on the seat next to himself. It takes them until after midnight to get to the hospital, and the morgue is closed. What to do with the body is his problem...

And how much valuable time is in making trips on public transportation! The need to interrogate suspects who are being kept under guard arises constantly. The solitary confinement cell is on the other side of town, and it takes half a day to get there and back... In a word, the investigator's everyday work is difficult and thankless, and the pay that he gets, to make no secret of it, is extremely low...

**K. Stolyarov:** Doesn't it seem to you that all this, to state it plainly, differs strikingly from the ideas that we usually have, ideas that have been promulgated by dozens, if not hundreds, of movies and television films? I do not doubt that reading about a rape or about dead bodies is not really so pleasant, but what can a person do? Unadorned truth differs from syrupy-sweet fairy tales in that, more frequently, it does not smell fragrantly, but stinks.

Actually the work performed by an investigator at a rayon procuracy required selfless devotion, a large amount of demand upon oneself, work to the point of exhaustion, frequently without quiet evenings with one's family and without any days off, and his salary is 170 rubles. True, in addition to his salary, the investigator gets a differential based on his level of certification, which differential varies from 20 rubles for a junior legal worker to 50 rubles for a Class I legal worker.

And now, for the purpose of getting a graphic picture, let us see how much a regional inspector in the militia earns. Together with additional payments for his stars and for longevity, he gets 300 rubles, if not more. I am not even speaking of such benefits as the right to retire after 25 calendar years of service, or the increased length of the annual leave—here the advantages of the militia workers are, in general, incomparable.

And there is something else—according to the regulations that are in effect, the regional inspector can have a rank up to major, inclusive, whereas for the investigator at the rayon procuracy the "ceiling" is a step lower—Class I legal worker, which corresponds to the rank of captain.

I hope to be correctly understood—I by no means feel that the earnings and ranks of the regional inspectors are unjustifiably inflated, or that their work is simple and easy. Definitely not. But, you will agree that our sense of social justice is always based on direct comparison—and with whom, other than the militia, would it be fitting to compare the workers at the procuracy?

One cannot fail to say that this unnatural disproportion has roots that go deep into the period of stagnation, when closeness to the upper heights and obstinacy in striving for various blessings, benefits, and privileges, both for oneself personally and for one's subordinates, proved to be stronger than arguments of intelligence, and, in the final analysis, the interests of the state. And who was closer to Brezhnev—Shchelokov and Churbanov, or the administrators of the USSR Procuracy, who, despite pressure from the top and regardless of threats, precisely at that time unmasked the corruption that had propagated in Krasnodar Kray, including in Sochi?

Obviously, I do not plan to reduce everything to the ruble. During the past 20 years there has gradually spread among us a kind of equable attitude toward the lack of talent. The feeling was that that is an ordinary phenomenon, and that in any sphere of human activity there are always, inevitably, leaders and outsiders, and there is nothing strange about this. But now, when the situation in the country has changed sharply, it is time for all of us to stop deluding ourselves—an ignorant, uncultured person, even one with a diploma, is definitely not a zero figure, but an obviously negative one, a stopper on the path to positive changes.

But how does one improve the selection of persons admitted to institutions of higher legal learning? I assume that V. Kalinichenko is right—the sole criteria for a person entering institutions of higher learning should be the person's knowledge and culture, rather than written statements concerning the "priority" social origin, or the frequently unobjective proofs of the person's special social participation. So far as I know, our Constitution does not contain any discriminatory limitations either for performing artists, painters, musicians, scientists, engineers, agronomists, journalists, writers, employees, etc., or for their children. If, in order to enter an institution of higher learning, a person has to have labor seniority, then, obviously, no one would object to that, but it is high time to renounce the rigid questionnaire principle.

What else is necessary for the efficient replenishing and reinforcing of the corps of Soviet investigators, as well as for the growth of their authority? Let us listen once again to the professionals.

**V. Kalinichenko:** What we need is the state's concern. The investigator's work day practically never ends at precisely 1800 hours. We prepare court documents in the evenings and on days off. Or do you think that frequently the investigator has the opportunity to do some work at home? No, the crowded conditions do not allow that. Certainly not immediately, but perhaps after ten years of work, the investigator ought not only to be given the right to additional living space, but also to provide him with realistic square meters...

And has anyone thought about the fact that, because of the "economizing" of expenses to maintain auxiliary personnel, the investigator expends the lion's share of his work time on purely technical work?... People say that in Czechoslovakia the investigators are sold automobiles at a discount that reflects the degree of use of the automobile for official purposes, and payment is made for gasoline in the same proportion.

**S. Vinokurov:** Let's look truth straight in the eye. However we strive to achieve a situation in which the only people engaged in investigation are capable, strong professionals, it is necessary to work with those people who exist today. Therefore I feel that there is a crying need to introduce into the table of organization of the procuracy the position of assistant investigator. Not above our table of organization, but within its confines.

That person would have both the salary and the official rank of the assistant procurator; his rights with respect to initiating cases, and to restraining and arresting people, should be limited, and he should work under the guidance of experienced investigators. Whenever an opening appears, a certification commission will decide which of the assistants is worthy of becoming an investigator.

This does not preclude a competitive system: several candidates could lay claim to a single position, and could compete for it. But if it turns out that one of them actually devoted to the job, loves it, and wants to engage in it, but lacks any of the requirements for independent work, but, under someone else's guidance, he can cope successfully with local tasks, then he can work as assistant investigator until he reaches retirement age and can be useful on the job to the extent of his capabilities.

All of us procurators at the rayon and city level are disturbed by the future of investigation. There have been discussions to the effect that investigation will be taken away from us. No one knows anything at all about this, but, in my conviction—and it is not just my conviction, but has been proven by time—investigation must definitely be kept at the rayon procuracy. Possibly for a limited category of criminal cases, but that is another question.

During the years of my work in the rayon, there was not a single unjustified arrest, and an average of only one case out of a hundred returned from court for additional investigation.

**A. Frolov:** I too am convinced that investigation must be kept at the rayon procuracy. Otherwise how will we be able to prepare a reserve for promotion? Where will we get cadres from, in order to create investigation groups when investigating large networks of violators?

On the contrary, it is necessary to reinforce the rayon level, for which purpose it is necessary to increase the salaries and raise the "ceilings" for the official ranks at the lower stages. And the differentials for the person's official rank should also be made considerable. Judge for yourself. Last year, in our system, every eleventh investigator was replaced, with almost half of them leaving the procuracy at their own request. This is an alarming symptom.

**V. Kalinichenko:** Despite the fact that the expenditures for maintaining the agencies of the procuracy in the country and those funds that we return to the state in the form of money and valuables confiscated from criminals—figures which, if not of a single order, are in any case of a close order—we of course do not raise the question of conversion to self-financing. But we are paying close attention to all the promising undertakings and we hope for the expansion of our administrators' rights by analogy with what has already been decided in the national economy.

Mention has already been made here of the difficulties in our profession, but no mention has been made about one thing—the risk, the fear of being shot down, which is something that, after a prolonged period of successes, could happen at any moment even to the best of us. For a professional, this is a tragedy, but it does happen, and it is an inglorious end...

Why am I saying this? Currently the press, basically speaking, has been reviling us investigators. And the press is correct to do this—if there have been mistakes and shoddy work, then the press should not remain silent about them. But there are also among us people of whom we are deservedly proud... Investigators are given awards much less frequently than athletes or, say, performing artists, and if, once in a blue moon, a person is given a governmental award, it is a classified U<sup>k</sup>ase, and no one knows about it.

As you can imagine, we also have our healthy pride. We also want our fellow citizens to know about our achievements in the fight for socialist legality. It is necessary for people not to fear us, but to put their firm hopes on us.

**K. Stolyarov:** What is my impression of this discussion?

To begin with, I would like to say a few words about the three people I spoke to. None of them are white-haired patriarchs who long ago reached retirement age and who are inclined, as frequently happens, to elegiacal reflections on the topic of "waning fecundity." Rather, they are energetic, powerful people who are 40 years of age, or thereabouts. They still will have to work a long time.

Let us take, for example, the problem of the expansion of the rights of administrators in paying for labor—this is actually upsetting many people. Are we not putting too much hope on enthusiasm and devotion to the job, the participants at the conference at the USSR Procuracy asked, at a time when we ought to be taking more complete consideration of the labor contribution made by each person and paying on the basis of the final results? Well, the asking of the question corresponds to the spirit of *perestroyka*.

When speaking about capable young people in the agencies of the procuracy, A. Frolov gave the following figure: every third investigator has a work longevity of less than three years. So if we postpone indefinitely the increasing of the material self-interestedness of that category of workers, I am afraid that A. Frolov's hopes of developing first-rate investigators out of them might unfortunately never be realized—soon we shall discover many of them either on a board of lawyers, or in the ranks of cooperative administrators, where it is said that shrewd legal specialists are needed.

And now I would like to say literally a few words about differentials for official ranks. Wits joke caustically that the "price" of a procurator's star nowadays compares with a cognac star. Actually, the difference in the size of the differential between, for example, a senior counsellor of justice (equivalent to colonel in military or militia terminology) and a Class III state counsellor of justice (a rank bestowed by Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet and equivalent to a major general) constitutes only five rubles. And the differential for the country's highest official rank of active state counsellor of justice, which corresponds to marshal of a fighting branch and which, for us, can be given only to the General Procurator, coincides with that which is given for the rank of junior lieutenant of militia. This is something that is absolutely beyond belief!

Let us call things by their true names—the vexatious miscalculations and absurdities that were mentioned are, in the absolute majority, the consequence of the period of stagnation, and we, society as a whole, must now eat the inedible fruits and correct the errors of the past. But the extent to which and the manner in which the protection of law and order will improve during the next five to seven years is difficult to predict: the "harvest" will depend upon what we ourselves "sow."

In this regard, it seems to me, one can no longer remain silent about the forthcoming reform in the organizational structure of investigation. What kind of reform is proposed? What will it bring? For the time being, this is a carefully concealed secret.

We may as well admit that we have had very rich experience in destroying and reorganizing. In this regard we could give odds to absolutely anyone. But at the same time we know how difficult it is to restore something that has been hastily destroyed, and how many funds, efforts,

and years are needed for this. Would it not be better to discuss openly the draft for the reform in investigation and to make a decision with a consideration of public opinion and the position taken by a broad group of professionals? Because, under the conditions of developing democracy, the reinforcement of socialist legality is a concern not only for the law-enforcement agencies, but also for our entire nation.

[Photograph caption:] "How heavy you are, you procurator's cap!" is the statement that can be made with complete justification, paraphrasing the well-known saying, by Roman Fedorovich Utkin, procurator at the reception room of USSR Procuracy, senior counsellor of justice. It is heavy because it is by no means always that the question that a visitor brings to him can find a rapid and desired resolution. It is heavy because one incorrectly stated word can put unjustified hope in the person's soul and can complicate life in an unpredictable way...

Today, on the path to the socialist legal state, the strictest observance of legality is absolutely indispensable. And that means that other work that is indispensable is the painstaking, well thought-out, and strenuous work performed by the investigators, procurators, judges, and lawyers.

5075

#### Youth Paper Admits Failure of Soviet/Czech Friendship Festival

*18000449 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 88 p 3*

[Article by Ye. Kalyadina and Ya. Yuferova, special correspondents, from Prague and Moscow: "No Ovations: A Postscript to the Friendship Festival"]

[Text] Let us be honest: although in the journalist jargon the word festival is invariably synonymous with the word celebration, we used to view the task of reporting on these traditional and certainly important events in the life of fraternal youth organizations without the fitting enthusiasm. We would always reserve for such reports the same, highly respectable place in the newspaper and, without further ado, fill it with the same optimistic text. Many of us are graduates of the school of festival reporting. But, masterpieces written there seem to be carbon copies of one another. First, guests would be welcomed by the host capital with flowers and smiles. Then, delegates would speak emotionally at antiwar meetings about things everyone must do save the planet from nuclear holocaust. Then, they would have interesting round table discussions on how to carry out decrees and resolutions and strengthen their fraternal cooperation. The next report would lavish compliments those who took part in cultural events. At last, that was followed by the account of the parting, invariably sad yet brightened with the hope of future meetings. One of our festival aces used to joke that best reports are written

without leaving the hotel room. Let us be self-critical: there is a grain of truth in this joke. But let us also be fair: in order to be highlighted properly, the event itself must be worth highlighting. This is self-evident.

This time, everything promised to be different. As a result, we were going to Prague to report on a new festival, one that had not been conceived along the old guidelines. Our newspaper was an early supporter of the idea of holding such a festival; the readers remember that we announced a contest for the right to be a representative at the festival. Many people took part in the contest. We awarded the tickets to those who had concrete business ties, not just emotional ties, to their Czechoslovak siblings. The title of one of our first reports from the festival, "The Festival Has a Business-like Air," seemed to correctly describe the essence of the upcoming Prague gathering.

Indeed, today's realities call for a fresh look even at such seemingly permanently canonized phenomena as socialist friendship. Declarations of love, even sincere ones, are no longer enough. The times insistently demand that we be close to each other not only in spirit, but in deed, too. The deeds, moreover, should be concrete and important; they should make everyone of us, and all of us collectively, better, should bring us closer to that ideal of the truly free human being that is at the root of our shared political system.

Thus, ahead of the Prague Festival its organizers made a unanimous decision to cancel all pomp and circumstance. We followed up with a report titled "More Work, Festival!" Yet, exhortations alone proved insufficient. Why?

The readers perhaps recall that one of the main tasks of the festival was to promote the implementation of the "Community" program. Three new agreements were signed at the festival, and this certainly is a great achievement. But, there could have been many more of them had the festival brought together, as was originally intended, real or potential partners and experts in their fields; not just very worthy representatives of various working collectives expressing abstract willingness to strengthen fraternal cooperation. In this case, the seminar part would have been conducted on a more literate level from the economic point of view; the seminar's proposals could have been more serious than the one put forward by "Uralmash" delegates who suggested exchanging Uralmash metal presses for Czech sneakers.

Unfortunately, there was no concrete or detailed discussion of the "Community" program at the festival. This happened because its organizers did not take proper care to encourage it. How did it happen, for instance, that, having come to Plzen, "Uralmash" delegates did not get to see their old partners at famed "Skoda"? Yet, if you believe official reports, "Uralmash" and "Skoda" are in the forefront of "Community's" implementation. And

when we asked the "Skoda" SSM committee chairman how "Community" is being implemented at the plant, he looked at us as though we were asking him about flights to Mars.

We recall how before leaving for the festival we were approached by a bright-eyed delegate from the Kharkov Turbine Plant Yelena Slobodenyuk. She thanked "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA" for selecting her; she would be able to talk at length with her "Community" partner at the "CKD-Vlansko" plant. Yet, in Prague Yelena was greatly upset: she was able to spend at "Vlansko" only 40 minutes, most of it during a break.

Trips to sister oblasts were organized. Gomel Oblast, for instance, has had a long-standing friendship with Czesche-Budejovice. Some 300 kids come each year to its young pioneer camps. This is no less important than worker exchanges at sister plants. The Gomel delegation, like any other, comprises young people of many occupations and professions. We recall agronomist Sergey Lepeshko, who at the meeting at the "Silon" chemical plant said: "I would like to get to the fields as soon as possible. Here, they have good agricultural specialists; the festival may end without me learning the most important things..."

An actress may wish to visit a theater, and a teacher a school. Why would not this be a good idea? We should, perhaps, without sacrificing geographical considerations, choose young people's delegate groups according to their professional interests. The business climate of the festival would only gain from this.

Perhaps for the first time, there were at the Prague Festival other turning points. At home, we have rejected the practice of embellishing reality. Now, another hard step has to be taken. We have already mentioned a well-known Czechoslovak journalist, a true friend of our country since May 1945, who having heard a self-critical speech by a raysoviet deputy where he discussed problems, noted bitterly: "His speech is antisoviet... And for so many years we have been telling our young people that they must follow your example..."

Perestroika and a new way of thinking are not just our domestic concerns. This is hard work not only for us, but for our friends as well.

The key moment of the festival were the seminar and speeches of the leaders of the two young people's organizations. It was a good day. The sincere and business-like tone set by Soviet delegates was shared by our Czech friends.

Many political pluses of the Prague Festival were described in our previous reports. Now let us talk about some unforeseen problems.

The press center was housed at the Soviet Science and Culture Society in Prague. They greeted us nicely on Monday, were a great help for a few days as we rushed to write and dictate our reports to Moscow, and then said good-bye to us on Friday. The weekend is sacred, even though the festival went on and the Soviet group left only on Sunday. We do not know how to explain the conduct of the society's Soviet employees: it practically took a miracle to convince them to open up the building for half a day on Saturday so that Soviet journalists could go on with their work. As the saying goes, you can't stop people from living well. But the nation doesn't send its professionals abroad so that they could live well. Let us add that the society's building also housed the festival-affiliated club "Prague-Moscow," which sponsored meetings of young cinema professionals and several professional meetings. A key discussion, "Komsomol and Perestroyka," was thus sabotaged. We have a slang word, *yavka*. This is exactly what was lacking. There was an empty hall. But let us not look for scapegoats. Let us learn our lessons instead. Perhaps, the political outcome of the festival should have been weightier. For this, we need good organization from the delegation as well as from our representatives abroad.

Many questions were directed to Mikhail Boliguzov, the "Sputnik" representative in the CSSR. In all his years of working abroad, the festival was perhaps the most important undertaking. How did it happen, then, that a significant part of the Soviet group was housed at PTU dormitories where a towel, hot water, an iron or a hanger became an illusory dream.

I think that our relations will not suffer if we develop a businesslike attitude to questions which depend not on mutual politeness but on the price of an international tourist package. We want to be understood correctly. We are not talking about five-star hotels here. Many countries stage youth gatherings on camp grounds with sleeping bag, and they are right to do so. What we are talking about here is the level of organization. It could have been higher even in the dorms.

We are still timid and not used to talking about this openly. Leonard Tenis, the komsomol secretary at the Riga Railroad Car Making Plant, became very famous at the festival. First of all, he badly needed to go to Prague. He had written to our newspaper and called the VLKSM Central Committee: he had an important business to transact. Within the framework of the "Community" program, his plant and the "Vukov" railroad institute had formed a temporary working collective. He had to bring their homework to Prague, so that in September, in Riga, they would continue their work, not start from scratch. But fame came to him for another, unexpected reason. When at the reception the VLKSM Central Committee secretary asked the group how they were doing, he heard the cheerful reply: "Everything is fine!" Only Leonard added, breaking the chorus: "The only thing is that I haven't been given any bed linen." Of course, everything was taken care of that same evening.

but when the important personages moved on, two Soviet citizens accosted Tenis and queried him, as it is usually done, who did he think he was, who had sent him there and did he or did he not know what to say and when. This is exactly what they asked him. Leonard was very upset and worried that the incident would reflect negatively on the "Community" program which the plant's Komsomol committee backs all the way. Everything is alright, Leonard, because the most important negotiating tools are in your hands.

We cannot leave unmentioned another problem, and a complex one at that. A problem that can breed, as the readers will see in another article in this issue, monstrous consequences. But let us think about it for a minute. Indeed, the Soviet citizen abroad, once he has been let loose among the storewindows' bounty, is not a pretty sight. But is this the whole truth?

Everyone of the 340 Soviet participants, like any other tourist, could change 500 roubles, which equals 5,000 korunas. You must agree that this is not a small sum for a young person; it is 2-to-3 times their monthly pay, and to pretend that you do not care how you spend that money would be hypocritical.

The week-long schedule was intense and during the infrequent breaks everyone would head for the stores to buy presents for mom, dad, little brother or sister—and for oneself, too. The onslaught on Prague stores certainly did not help enhance the prestige of Soviet young people. Yet, the delegation comprised truly wonderful, worthy young men and women. Is it their fault, really? Who should protect the prestige of Soviet citizens abroad? In this particular situation, a great solution was suggested at the festival by Hungarian friends: several hours before the opening of the festival, a large trading firm scheduled to meet with Soviet participants. Translators and consultants helped solve all the problems, having at the same time created a promotional display of folk souvenirs which would leave no one cold.

The Komsomol has experience organizing specialized youth fairs, too. There are other possibilities as well. One thing we should not do is to pretend that this is no one's business.

The 4th Festival had not only Prague-based problems, but Moscow-based ones as well. For instance, what are we to make of the fact that delegates who came to Moscow before the Festival were cast on their own devices for two full days? Of the fact that they were not provided with normal lodging and food, to say nothing of a respectable program? And what about the official festival delegation uniform, called "accoutrements" in the official parlance? Not once have we seen a single representative of Soviet young people put it on. And not because the group turned out to be too picky. It is simply that they figured that to spend 60 roubles on those grey robes of unknown style or size would come too dear.

What are, then, the responsibilities of our organizers of bilateral gatherings? Why bother to create a command post six months ahead of the festival? Why did its representatives make numerous trips to the host country for discussions? Why send to the festival 20 officials responsible for organizing it? Maybe, to let them spend entire nights at meetings even though next morning delegates would not have the slightest idea what the day's schedule were? Maybe, to let them hang welcome banners and the gathering's emblems at the festival center three days after the start of the festival, and the flags of the participating nations four days after? Why set up a press center if the list of Soviet delegates is available only when no one needs it any longer? Finally, what representatives of our organizations are being sent abroad for? Not to observe but to strengthen and develop friendly ties between our nations. It is to achieve this goal of effective strengthening of our friendship that joint festivals are being held. We have learned this simple truth a long time ago. Yet, unfortunately, we do not always know how to implement it honestly and professionally.

In Prague, veteran organizers often recalled the past, comparing notes on the Berlin, Volgograd or Havana festivals. We, on the other hand, have a memory of some very bitter words uttered by Sverdlovsk VLKSM Obkom's First Secretary Mikhail Matveyev: "Of course, the failures of this festival will be a good lesson for the future. But I feel sorry for the kids. For most of them, this festival was their first and last one. I had a thought: had the Prague gathering's organizers thought of it as their first and last one, perhaps none of us would have had a reason to be sorry."

12892

#### IZVESTIYA Analyzes Solutions to Sugar Shortage

18300257 Moscow *IZVESTIYA* in Russian  
7 May 88 p 1

[Article by Vladimir Nadein under the "Events and Opinion" rubric: "There's Nothing to Sweeten the Pill"]

[Text] Today, as the sugar is disappearing from Moscow shelves, there is no way we can avoid certain unpleasant but altogether inevitable questions.

The first question is: Were we ready for such a turn of events?

No. The last time the country experienced similar difficulties was the late 1940's. Since then sugar has always been available everywhere. What is more, its easy availability gave rise to a certain distortion in our diet. Physicians began to warn us about overindulging. Of course it never was a question of simply removing sweets from the table. Fruits, grapes, honey and melons—that is what was supposed to have supplanted the sugar.

Unfortunately we were neither able to supplant it nor to constrict its use. And therefore the sugar shortage leaves a gap that nothing can fill.

The situation is aggravated by two circumstances: First, the role of sugar in nourishing the children; it is not hard to imagine the anger and frustration of parents when they have nothing with which to sweeten their child's cereal. The second circumstance is the indefinite nature of the prospects for improvement.

Hence the second question: has sugar disappeared for long?

To answer that question, there is no need to possess secret information. A serious gap has formed between supply and demand. It can be removed either by increasing supply (expanding production, increasing imports), or by reducing demand (raising prices, issuing ration books), or finally, a combination of these measures. There is no other means of solving this problem.

It would appear that in the given situation this model does not apply, since the sole reason for the sugar shortage is the manufacture of moonshine liquor. However, this distinction appears to be important only at first glance. Sugar for jam and sugar for making moonshine is acquired with the very same rubles and at times in equally large amounts. Consequently, the demand of a moonshiner is demand too, and administrative-criminal measures on its effects are nothing less than a means of rationalizing the consumption of sugar.

It would be self-deception to pin one's hopes on achieving a one-and-a-half or twofold increase in sugar production this year. In the first quarter production increased by 11 percent in comparison with the first quarter of last year; but the industry has no solid reserves. And hopes for imports are not great either. What's more, it would be a sin to spend foreign exchange for the enjoyment of moonshiners.

Perhaps prices should be raised? Without overall improvement of the price system, this idea should be decisively rejected. What about rationing cards then? On the order of one or one-and-one-half kilos per capita? Many people believe that, while this is not very much, it is a guarantee. However, such rationing, even on the basis of scientifically-calculated norms, will not satisfy the rightful needs of the populace (for making compotes, and preparing home-made sweetmeats). And exchanging free trade for limited distribution gives rise to a lot of negative consequences: hoarding of goods, speculation, and even greater strains on the "buyer-seller relationship." (Under conditions of distribution these words can be used only in an ironical sense.)

Thus, there are no special production reserves, and demand can be limited only to a modest degree. Should we hope for a swift solution to the sugar shortage as long as the conditions which gave rise to it remain unchanged? The answer should be obvious.

The principal, if not the only method for solving the problem, seems to be stepping up administrative and legal prosecution of moonshiners. This method appears to be reliable. The fact of the matter is, should we put an end to moonshine liquor, the situation would improve at once.

However, the third question is a stumbling block for us: Can we put an end to moonshining, relying chiefly on fines, confiscation of property and deprivation of freedom?

For a clear view of the picture, we should divide the moonshiners into two groups, which while outwardly similar are in fact very different: into the commodity manufacturers, whose purpose is regular sales (the professionals), and into those who make liquor for themselves and for a narrow circle of intimates (the amateurs).

It is comparatively easy to seek out the professional. Sales is the Achilles' heel of the shadow economy. However, seeking them out does not mean grabbing them. With prices reaching 10 rubles per bottle, the professionals have amassed great amounts of money, which they energetically apply to improving their technology, putting together a mafia, and bribing the law-enforcement organs. Nor is it easy to display civic responsibility. The incredibly long lines, and the adventurous declaration of "sobriety zones," which do not have the support of the public, have created for the professionals an atmosphere of comfort and informal protection.

Confiscation, while practically harmless to the professional, can turn out to be a severe punishment for the

amateur who violates the law from time to time. But here is another difficulty: moonshining in non-commercial amounts is done in great secrecy. There is no reliable means for discovering it. Even the smallest operation by the militia is fraught with the danger of violating the constitutional principles of the inviolability of one's home and the presumption of innocence.

We ought to honestly acknowledge that we cannot build the scaffold of punishment any higher; we must recognize that the real capabilities of the militia in the struggle with moonshining have nearly reached their limits. And we must recognize that every new step, taken blindly without regard to obstacles, causes a disproportionate number of victims among the public.

Would society agree to that?

It has already infringed on the interests of women (lotions and hair lacquer), on men (eau de cologne), on motorists (antifreeze and de-icing fluid), on the ill (medicines containing alcohol), and on vacationers (a mug of beer at mid-day in July).

But sugar—that's going too far. The sugar must be restored. Its shortage will be applied directly to the account of perestroika. The arguments which people accepted good-naturedly just two years ago, today are irritating at best. This is no less dangerous than drunkenness. In the third year of perestroika, we must not allow a situation in which the people nostalgically associate shelves full of candy with the time of stagnation.

In this entire affair there is one positive feature: the administrative-command method has once again proven its universal ineptitude in regulating the economy. The experience acquired permits us to re-examine the "sobriety zones" and the queues for wine, the transformation of import breweries into dispensers of native juices, and the uprooting of grapevines. It is important to act quickly and decisively: it is more difficult to treat a neglected disease.

09006

**Text of 21 Jun NKAO Soviet Decision**  
*183003/6a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian*  
*24 Jun 88 p 1*

[Article from SOVETAKAN KARABAKH No. 145, 23 Jun 88: "Decision of the Extraordinary Session of the Soviet of People's Deputies of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, 20th Convocation, 21 Jun 88 on the Situation in the Oblast and Measures to Stabilize It"]

[Text] 1. At its extraordinary session on 20 February 1988, the Soviet of People's Deputies of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, meeting the desire of working people of the NKAO, asked the AzSSR Supreme Soviet and the ArSSR Supreme Soviet to show a sense of thorough understanding of the aspirations of the Armenian population of Nagornyy Karabakh and resolve the question of transferring NKAO from the AzSSR to the ArSSR. At the same time, it petitioned the USSR Supreme Soviet for a positive resolution of the question of transferring NKAO from the AzSSR to the ArSSR.

After considering this question, on 13 June 1988 the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the AzSSR and also on 17 June 1988 the Seventh Session of the Supreme Soviet of the AzSSR, 11th Convocation, found it unacceptable. A detailed and thorough study of the resolution and decision of the supreme bodies of state power of the AzSSR on this question results in the simple conclusion that both the Presidium of the AzSSR Supreme Soviet and the Presidium of the ArSSR do not correctly understand the meaning and content of the 20 February 1988 decision of the NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies. Their response on the unacceptability of this decision resembles a hasty answer written for form only more than it does a legal act of supreme bodies of state power of a Soviet socialist republic. For otherwise, non-recognition of an act aimed at implementing the Leninist principle of free self-determination of nations is not at all compatible with the calling of the supreme bodies of state power of a Soviet socialist republic.

2. The NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies expresses its dissent with the 13 June 1988 resolution of the Presidium of the AzSSR Supreme Soviet and the 17 June 1988 decision of the Seventh Session of the AzSSR Supreme Soviet "On the Petition of the Deputies of the NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies on Transferring the Oblast from the AzSSR to the ArSSR" and, taking into account the situation that has developed, expressing the will of the Armenian population of Nagornyy Karabakh, and based on the need for consistent implementation of the Leninist principle of free self-determination of nations which is at the basis of the national-state structure of our unified multinational state, believes it necessary again to make a request to the USSR Supreme Soviet to examine closely the 15 June 1988 decision of the ArSSR Supreme Soviet session which consented to accepting NKAO as

part of the ArSSR and the 20 February 1988 decision of the Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies session "On Transferring NKAO from the AzSSR to the ArSSR" and favorably resolve the issue.

In order to stabilize the emergency situation that has developed in the oblast and to return to a normal working rhythm, request the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, as the only acceptable option at this stage, temporarily subordinate the autonomous republic to the USSR government until a final and favorable resolution of the question of Nagornyy Karabakh is reached.

3. The NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies petitions the USSR Supreme Court, taking into account the need for a fundamental political and legal assessment of the events in the city of Sumgait, AzSSR, the malicious distortion of the essence of massive state crimes committed in this city—thuggery and mass disorders—and the attempt on the part of the AzSSR Supreme Court to portray them as hooligan-motivated murders, and also the fact that atrocities of the Sumgait thugs, incompatible with the principles of socialism, have already caused enormous damage to the political and moral life of the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples and their traditional good-neighbor relations, and guided by Paragraph 1, Article 27 of the USSR Law on the USSR Supreme Court, to take over the criminal cases on these crimes, thoroughly and objectively consider them as the court of first instance, and pass a severe but fair sentence on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. To approve the text of the appeal of participants of the present session to the 19th All-Union Party Conference

5. The NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies calls upon the working people of the oblast everywhere to restore the rhythm of normal work in enterprises, organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, to mobilize every effort to make up for the arrears in sectors of the national economy, and to welcome the 19th Party Conference with a normalization of working rhythm.

12567

**Kirovakan Officials Resist Construction of 1918 Armenian Victory Monument**  
*183003/6b Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian*  
*24 Jun 88 p 4*

[Article by N. Mesropyan: "The Monument"]

[Text] The word "initiative" has a special meaning to a person who worked at a newspaper at the very height of the period of stagnation. We had to write about all kinds of initiatives and, I must confess, invent and make them up. In some places it was considered a matter of honor to become authors of some kind of initiative. There were authors of initiatives for increasing labor productivity

lowering costs, struggling for high quality.... In Kirovakan, for example, the following slogan was popular in the country: "Not a single person lagging behind nearby." This concerned not only workers who, let us say, were quite capable of helping a comrade next to them who was lagging behind, but also entire enterprises. The question repeatedly came up, for example, about how the tricot factory could help the machine tool plant, but they preferred not to recall such "trifles" and simply paid them no heed. During the struggle to implement another initiative—turning Kirovakan into a city of a communist way of life—they built a good 10 restaurants and not a single club. Considering the communist way of life ensured, the began expanding the initiative. They added high productivity, quality, and later even exemplary law and order. Quite a few people talked about immediate implementation of these initiatives and shortly even began summing up the results. Had it not been for reforms in the life of our society, I am sure that today they would begin saying that all the plans have been accomplished and that we live, work, and rest exemplarily and maintain exceptionally efficient law and order.

There were many initiatives, but when the time came to judge the job by deeds and not by words, a rather unattractive picture was brought to light. In a city where the idea was not to have a single industrial enterprise lagging behind, suddenly one after another former leading enterprises began wrecking the plans. Despite the abundance of well-described plans of social development, it turned out that thousands of people in the next few years still would not receive apartments. Not all was in order with law and order. In general, a multitude of problems cropped up, which of course were known about before but were not talked about aloud. In short, many of the "initiatives" remained just that, without being transformed into concrete deeds. In reflecting upon sad facts of this sort, one inevitably comes across the same question: Why were there so many soap bubbles?

Let us recall how the "initiatives" of the popular masses arose. The author of these lines was present in many cases, so this is first-hand information. A phone call came from above. Why not show some initiative and undertake such and such commitments (unimportant what kind) in honor of such and such jubilee (unimportant which one). Of course, those who were called agreed to do it. They then summoned the party committee secretaries and the director of some enterprise enjoying a good reputation. Will you do it? Of course, they immediately agreed. After all, its was flattering that they were the ones chosen, that they were the ones about whom the newspapers and television would soon be talking. The leaders returned to the enterprise, summoned someone from a list of leading workers established long ago, and handed them a prepared text. They said, we will soon gather people together and you will read it. And they read, gave speeches, made decisions and posed in front of cameras. Then other sort of followed their example.

We writers created some kind of appearance of a competition, a fight, although it was incomprehensible why they should fight in a place where normal efficient work was needed.

I will not describe in detail the process of emergence and "implementation" of the numerous initiatives of this type; it is well known. And these initiatives failed basically because, in coming about upstairs, they were presented as a live creation of the masses, remaining alien in their essence to the people.

Other times have come. The time has come to listen to the real voice of the people, to think about true government by the people, not power "in the name" and "on behalf" of the people. Right at this point the usual stream of "initiatives" sort of stopped, and genuine initiatives, which in fact emerged in the lower strata and requiring concrete deeds, encountered serious resistance. The labor collective council of the Aviomatika Scientific Production Association ran into all sorts of difficulties from the very first meetings after adopting a number of out-of-ordinary decisions, right up to expressing a vote of no-confidence for the general director. The collectives' statements were received with obvious hostility after they decided not to agree with the opinion of the gorkom and not to accept the next chief appointed from above, but to elect those they believed to be most deserving. There were enough other types of conflicts, and not only with the gorkom, but with main administrations, ministries, and various inspecting organizations which still rage today, taking away a lot of costly work time.

But one of the recent conflicts in Kirovakan merits special attention. Today in the city they call it the "case of the monument."

In 1918, as we know, Armenian volunteers were successfully fighting against Turkish invaders not only in Sardarapat and Bash-Aparan, but also in Karaklis, now Kirovakan. They fought heroically to the last drop of blood. The Turkish officers, having fought earlier in Mesopotamia, admitted that they had never encountered such fierce resistance anywhere. Marshal Bagramyan highly appraised the Karaklis battle.

But a surprising fact is that for many years the prominent role of the Karaklis battle was recognized only in various monographs not accessible to readers at large. The novel by M. Amirkhan devoted to these events, "On the Last Patch of Land," published in a small edition, also remained unnoticed. Meanwhile, grand monuments were built in Sardarapat and Aparan, and the feats of the heroes of these battles finally found a deserving place in the people's memory. But what about Karaklis? Why was it forgotten?

When the Sardarapat Complex opened 20 years ago, in Kirovakan they began saying that they needed to build a monument there also. Unfortunately, the talks remained

just that. Later on, this matter was brought up many times, but the higher-ups showed complete indifference. Yes, they said, it would be nice, but you see we have more important problems facing us now. Public opinion, which had barely had time to wake up from its many years of lethargy, again lapsed into a lingering and quiet indifference.

This time, on the eve of the 70th anniversary of the battle, they had no objective excuses. Proponents of establishing a monument came up with a weighty argument: in Kirovakan there was no monument to the victims of the 1915 genocide. On 24 April, the citizens, considering it their civic duty to honor the memory of the victims, for the lack of another place to go, are forced to go to church, where at the entrance khachkary are set up in memory of the victims of the genocide. Flowers are also placed at their pedestal. To a newcomer, on this day Kirovakan may appear to be the most faithful city: nearly all the population goes to church. I dare say that a large part of them are non-believers and even atheists. If a monument is built in honor of the battle, they can also hold the annual ceremonies here on the memorial day of the victims of the genocide.

The argument sort of seemed convincing, at least from the standpoint of atheistic indoctrination of the young people. After coordinating the idea with the gorkom and personally with 1st Secretary G. Oganyan, a group of the public from the city wrote an open letter to the editorial staff of the newspaper KAITS. Published shortly thereafter and finding broad support, it called for widespread celebration of the 70th anniversary of the battle and laying on the day of the anniversary the first stone of a future monument. It was also to erect the monument using funds collected by the townspeople. The residents of Kirovakan heartily approved of all points in the letter. The phones rang continually in the editorial office. People wanted to know where to transfer funds; to whom to address suggestions concerning the future monument; and on what day, at what time and where the ceremonial laying of the stone would take place. But the editorial office could not answer a single one of these questions. And here is the reason.

After having approved the laying of the monument, the gorkom then, as the saying goes, went into reverse. I do not know what stopped the leadership of the gorkom. Perhaps it was the very great enthusiasm of the people, or the fact that the initiative this time did not originate with them but with the lower strata. No matter what the reason, at all the meetings they began telling the people that the laying of the monument was forbidden, they say, above. In the string of dark days came one bright day: the gorkom had made up its mind to celebrate the anniversary and even gave its concurrence to announce the day and time of the festivities in the local newspaper. However, the announcement did not appear in the newspaper.

An ambiguous situation arose: the people interested in building the monument were told that the gorkom was in complete agreement with them. Officially, everything, even conversations regarding the monument, was forbidden.

Just 2 days before the anniversary it became known that the anniversary would nevertheless be celebrated and the first stone laid. But again no announcement was published in the newspaper. The local radio station also was silent. No one wanted to answer all the questions regarding this.

Desperate in their attempts to achieve something officially, the people took perhaps an extreme step. They themselves wrote and posted announcements around the city. They contained nothing seditious, but simply informed the residents of Kirovakan that the laying of the first stone of the future monument would take place at 12:00 on 28 May at the western outskirts of the city. The innocent text, however, aroused the genuine fury of the city authorities. An entire platoon of militiamen tore down the notices, even when the platform on the grass plot had already been set up for the festivities and the area had been equipped with radio. Why? No one wants to answer this question. Just as no one will want to assume responsibility for the order to tear down the notices.

During these same hours, the city soviet session was taking place.

"When will we celebrate the anniversary?" the deputies asked 1st Secretary G. Oganyan.

"Either Saturday or Sunday," he replied.

It was announced to the collective of the pedagogic institute: "We will celebrate the anniversary on Sunday."

It turned out that they decided nevertheless to hold the ceremony, but to try to see that as few people as possible gather for the laying of the stone. Although the authors of the paradoxical decision did not explain their intentions and later on even categorically denied their involvement in the multi-step system of prohibition, their goal became clear to everyone. They were merely trying to discredit the idea and wanted to demonstrate that an initiative originating in the lower strata cannot find broad popular support. In short, this is another example of the machinery's stubborn resistance to new changes.

But in spite of everything, the people gathered together and laid the stone. The announcements about the ceremony hung in the city for just over an hour, but thousands of people came to the site of the historic battle, and some of them told the officials bluntly that their work style resembles the past more than the present.

**Armenian Writer Khanzadyan on Causes, Meaning of NKAO Crisis**

18300272 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian  
29 May 88 p 4

[Interview with Sero Nikolayevich Khanzadyan by S. Seyranyan: "The Moment of Truth"; date and place not given]

[Text] Land is land. It needs constant attention. It is not surprising, then, that we found Sero Khanzadyan in the garden. His jacket with the Gold Star of a Hero of Socialist Labor and the badge of a deputy to the republic's supreme soviet had been left at the house; here he was in a simple coarse linen shirt. The writer was using shears to cut rose bushes—cautiously, one might even say with some tenderness. Behind the roses stood even rows of trees. So, to use the language of farm reports, "field work was in full swing" here.

We went up the stairs to the writer's second-floor study. Just as before, it held two desks: a large one and a small one with the little old Underwood that had been around a long time, and the ottoman with its plaid blanket. All just as before. Even coming here was as simple as simple could be, just as always: all I had to do was stop a taxi and tell the driver: "To Sero Khanzadyan's." Everything the same and yet not the same. The telephone rang more than usual, on the desk was a pile of unopened mail—the writer's flow of correspondence had grown considerably in the recent past, there were more visitors, meetings, and conversations. So that the time of trial and hopes which we are experiencing today had penetrated that entire house....

"There is a great deal of mail, a very great deal," Sero Nikolayevich said. "Somehow at this time I have been remembered most frequently by old and new friends, they want to cheer me up and give some advice. And here is a quite recent letter from a man I do not know, Gennadiy Ivanovich Maslov, a party member who lives in Minsk. He writes to me personally, but it is all about Armenia, about his love for it. There are dozens of such letters. Today as never before each of us must feel responsibility for everything happening around us, a measure of responsibility to the times."

[Question] It seems to me that we should speak only in the context of the times, of those truly great changes which our country is experiencing today.

[Answer] Yes, no question about it, and that is the only way. You know, anyone who went through the fire of the Great Patriotic War will always look at everything through the eyes of a fighter at the front line. The war was such an event for our generation that in one way or another it has singed everything we created. I keep coming back to it constantly in my books, not just in "Three Years 291 Days." This theme has resounded very strongly against the background of the country's life. Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, whether they wanted it or not, in some hidden way suggested to us the idea that the

victory of communism was inevitable, since social progress was inevitable in our country. That belief dulled our political senses, deprived the literary man of the possibility of developing the full power of his talent. Why go to great lengths if the radiant future was merely going to drop into our hands like a ripe apple?

Through literature they wanted to suggest to the people the idea that there are no complicated problems in life, there are no great moral collisions, everything is pretty much fair weather. And if some things in some places are at times unresolved, these are temporary difficulties that are quickly overcome. Against that background the books of the writers who had fought at the front awakened civic thinking, taught people to think and empathize. Through the war, through people's destinies we arrived at the problems of the present day. Literature performed its great humanistic function in that period above all through the subject matter of wartime. It is as though we were talking about the war, but not only about the war; the best examples of the literature of the war forced people to think about the roads our country was taking, and the conclusions were not always consoling by any means. Considerably less was permitted to be said about the other spheres of our life, although some, by virtue of their talent, were able to say more than others, Fedor Abramov, for example, or Rasul Gamzatov. But just imagine if Fedor Abramov had had the chance to write in this time. With his power and his universal pain for his desecrated country.... Can you imagine?

What was left for many writers to do? Either to rhapsodize the achievements, to speak half the truth, or to write "for the trunk." The practice of "standardized criticism" did considerable harm to literature.

But now the long-awaited moment of truth has come, the 27th CPSU Congress, restructuring. Many people wanted it, many dreamed about it, some even were afraid to think about anything of the kind, but today restructuring is reality. Reality because it has been supported by the people, by the intelligentsia, and that includes the best people of our republic, who have very fervently supported it. And even now when they ask me what is the most important event in my entire life, I reply without hesitation: restructuring.

We writers, like many other figures in literature and art, scientists, as well as workers and kolkhoz members of Armenia, now no longer think of ourselves in a different social context; restructuring has been absorbed into our blood. And in the immense system of restructuring the nationality question is one of the most important archives; this is a most painful issue that we have inherited from the period of the stagnation. Our country's leaders understand that. For instance, M.S. Gorbachev said in a speech at the ceremonies commemorating the 70th Anniversary of Great October that "the

nationality question in our country is a living issue of live reality." I repeat once again: "A living issue of live reality." In my view, this is a very accurate and very broad definition....

The unstable situation will soon have persisted for 4 months in Nagornyy Karabakh, Baku, Sumgait, Kirovabad, and in our republic. The tension sometimes rises, sometimes abates. These events are well-known to the entire world. Incredibly tragic events have occurred.

Beginning in mid-February our union press and information channels have been offering inaccurate and frequently contradictory information about the events in Nagornyy Karabakh and around it. People both in Armenia and also in Azerbaijan have been unable to obtain reliable knowledge of what was happening. Back on 3 March I, Rachiya Ovanesyan, and Vardges Petrosyan went to Moscow and talked with various officials and went to TASS and asked that everything happening in Nagornyy Karabakh and around it be described fairly. This was the demand of hundreds of thousands and millions of people. Then more detailed information began to appear in the press, but unfortunately it still did not give the full picture of what was happening. These are very complicated issues, and attempts to portray them in the newspapers simply and comprehensibly often result in an oversimplification of the processes taking place. And so the stream of materials in the press, including our own republic press, about the eternal friendship, about brothers living for centuries alongside one another, had the opposite effect in that context.

But pose yourself the question: What is the cause of the aggravation of the situation around Nagornyy Karabakh? A role is played here not only and not so much by the bad socioeconomic situation, as by the insult to the sentiments of national dignity. And this has been happening to the sons of that Karabakh who shed their blood for establishment of Soviet power in the Caucasus and who took the most active part in the October Revolution. The Karabakhs left 22,000 dead out of 45,000 soldiers, officers, generals, and marshals who took part in the war on the altar of the triumph of the Great Patriotic War. Natives of Karabakh have given our country many well-known scientists and figures in literature and art who even today are working for the good of our Soviet homeland. This needs to be the point of departure in drawing conclusions about the nature of the popular demonstrations that have begun, the rallies in Yerevan and other cities of the country, at which approval was given to the Appeal to the General Secretary on the Karabakh issue.

[Question] They would like to represent some of the events concerning Nagornyy Karabakh as an expression of age-old enmity between Armenians and Azerbaijanis. These are the thoughts of people who for one reason or another want that to be the case. How do matters actually stand?

[Answer] Ideas of that kind do not have any basis at all. We are neighbors and must live in peace. I personally have been friends for a long time with many sons of Azerbaijan. I had wonderful fraternal relations with Samed Vurgun, and do now with I. Kasumov and N. Khazri. In my stories and novellas I have portrayed Azerbaijanis repeatedly. Nazir Mamed Saatov of the village Bash-Geymuk in Shchekinskiy Rayon, with whom I fought against the enemies of the homeland on the Volkhov Front, has remained my close friend to this day. My friend from the front, Orudzh Yusupov, a soldier in my platoon, often visits me with his son Kagraman.

[Question] The nationality question is one of the most important ones not only now, but for all time; we have already spoken about that. How in your view does restructuring affect ethnic relations? How should restructuring proceed in this matter?

[Answer] The events in Nagornyy Karabakh and around it have shown once again that the "status quo" can do irreparable harm to restructuring in ethnic relations. Today as never before we need political flexibility and wise statesmanship, those qualities which I am afraid have been lacking in our leaders not only in the period of stagnation, but even before that. The problems, which have not been resolved at all, existed in reality even then. They built up somewhere and inevitably had to find an outlet one fine day. I think that the popular demonstrations in Nagornyy Karabakh and around it are not the result of an "excess of democracy," as some people would like to represent it, but a consequence of the fact that the issues that build up have not been resolved, and one fine day all of this had to break through. What puts me on the alert in this connection, and here I speak on the basis of the way events have developed, is that in the so-called period of stagnation we lost our political flexibility, the ability to react quickly to changes in a situation. I get the impression that some people would like to place the events taking place, which are truly unprecedented in our country's history, on the Procrustes' bed of "regular situations," that is, situations which have occurred before in our country's history. This is incorrect.

[Question] Yes, that is so, and what is more, the situation is heated up by all kinds of rumors in which it is difficult if not impossible to separate the grain of truth from the abundant cockle of lies. No doubt this is to some degree a consequence of the absence of full information.

[Answer] I get the impression that there have been attempts to put all the blame for what has happened on the former first secretary of the Nagornyy Karabakh Party Obkom, Kevorkov, and Muslim-zade, first secretary of the Sumgait Party Gorkom. Is this valid? Kevorkov, as you know, has been relieved of his post and has gone off to Baku, but, it seems to me, the ground has not been dug out from under the feet of Kevorkovism—

a system in which the leader of the oblast, an autonomous oblast at that, is simply an obedient executor of what is required of him. Moreover, he does not think about what he is doing. Or again, it seems that everything is clear with Muslim-zade....

[Question] I had occasion to see and listen to Muslim-zade when I was working in the Komsomol press at a traditional meeting of the young people of the republics of the Transcaucasus at Krasnyy Most. He spoke at length, beautifully, he spoke about friendship and fraternity among peoples....

[Answer] That was like him, and not only like him, but many leaders, including leaders in Armenia, and unfortunately it is far from eradicated even today. Behind the beautiful words, which say the right thing, there is emptiness or even a reluctance to do anything, an absence of political feeling. The events of the recent past confirm once again that the time for fine words has passed, and the time has come for responsible and wise deeds. Very serious, arduous, and decisive deeds. At this point, if events are judged with the old measuring rods, the cause could be spoiled altogether.

For many years I, along with many men of letters and representatives of various professions have written about how the state of affairs with public education is extremely bad in Karabakh: there is a shortage of textbooks in the Armenian language that correspond in the slightest to generally accepted standards of the schools, historical and cultural monuments are in many cases in a pitiable state, and all kinds of obstacles are set up to block cultural exchange with Armenia.... And what then? Have steps been taken? If they have, then only against the letter writers. And all the while the resentment at the situation that has been created both in Nagornyy Karabakh itself and also outside it has little by little come to a head. It has come to a head over the years, over decades.

And returning once again to the events in Nagornyy Karabakh, I feel that our people is continuing to stand firmly on its feet and to believe in a fair resolution of the issues that have arisen; we are continuing to work in the fields and mills. Now is the time for truly reasonable and sober solutions.

07045

**Yerevan University Official Advocates New Union, Autonomous Republics**  
18300340 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian  
25 Jun 88 p 3

[Interview with Professor L. Karapetyan, doctor of philosophical sciences and prorector of Yerevan State University, by Armpress correspondent; date and place not given]

[Text] As we know, the 19th All-Union Party Conference will give much attention to questions of international

relations and the development of each nation and nationality. An Armpress correspondent talked with Professor L. Karapetyan, doctor of philosophical sciences and prorector of Yerevan State University, in this regard.

[Question] On the eve of the summit between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, an American correspondent asked CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev: "Is your policy of perestroyka necessitating fundamental changes in the current relations between the nationalities which populate the USSR?" M.S. Gorbachev gave an extremely clear and objective answer: "With us it is not a question of changing the socialist principles of relations between the nations and nationalities of our country. But we will correct violations of these principles. The events taking place recently in some of our republics were caused precisely by this." How would you comment on this statement?

[Answer] If it is a question of violations of socialist principles of interethnic relations, it must be understood that these principles were approved and were functioning at some stage of our country's development.

We know that the basic principles of national policy and development of interethnic relations in a multinational socialist society were developed by the founders of scientific socialism. They were creatively developed in the works of V.I. Lenin and in program documents of the Leninist party of Bolsheviks.

Tenets, such as equality of all nations and nationalities, abolition of all national oppression, ensuring the right of nations to self-determination and creating conditions for their unification on a truly democratic basis, achieving actual equality of all nations and nationalities, and ensuring their comprehensive growth and rapprochement, occupy a central place in Marxist-Leninist theory and the program on the nationality issue. In their sum total, they express the requirement of the universal principle of harmonious combination international and national interests. Practical implementation of these principles became possible after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. From its very first days of its activities in this area, the party of Bolsheviks proceeded from the fact that there could not be internationalism without taking national interests into account or without combining them with the interests of the whole state.

In the process of establishing Soviet power in our multinational country, first of all the question arose of creating a national state system of liberated peoples. This is explained by the fact that "foreigners" of tsarist Russia did not have their own state system. V.I. Lenin brilliantly foresaw that only with a consistently democratic resolution of this problem, as well as other problems of national relations, would the working masses of the various nations and nationalities be able to obtain the opportunity of independent government and themselves unified into a single multinational socialist state. "...If

only the oppressors of yesterday," he pointed out, "did not insult the highly developed democratic feeling of self-respect of a long-oppressed nation, if only they had offered it equality in everything, including in construction, in the experiment to build 'their' state..."

The party of bolsheviks not only proclaimed but also ensured for all nations the actual opportunity to create a national state and implement the right to self-determination. Many nations and nationalities acquired statehood and were involved in active political thought. Simultaneously, they established a close alliance with Soviet Russia and soon expressed a voluntary desire to unite with it into a single multinational federative state.

It is also known that a different approach was discovered in the process of practical resolution of this important but difficult problem. Some proposed creating a "confederation of republics;" others proposed so-called "autonomization." In his works and speeches, V.I. Lenin showed the fallacy of these plans and explained that a "confederation" would not ensure achievement of the set goal of creating a monolithic state, and "autonomization" could result in violation of the principle of equality of the republics being united and to the manifestation of great-power chauvinistic tendencies. Actually, the enormous work of the party and the successes achieved in establishing new, truly democratic relations between nations could be negated.

In summarizing the positive results of the initial period of development of the federative ties of independent Soviet republics, V.I. Lenin gave paramount attention to the need for absolute observance of such principles of the Soviet Socialist Federation as voluntary participation in the unification, equality of the republics, and the right to self-determination. Lenin considered consistent implementation of these principles to be a most important guarantee of combining national and international interests and ensuring scientific management of the multinational Soviet state.

[Question] As noted in the Theses for the 19th Party Conference, in this lie our strength and guarantee of prosperity of our country as a whole, as well as of each nation and nationality separately. The remarkable results of implementing the Leninist national policy during the 70 years since the October Revolution are known to all.

[Answer] Yes, life has completely confirmed the great leader's foresight. Having united on a federative basis into a unified socialist state, with the fraternal assistance of the great Russian people, previously oppressed peoples were able to consolidate the revolutionary gains and ensure their national and social regeneration. It is known that before the establishment of Soviet power, there was virtually no industry in Siberia, Central Asia, the Caucasus and other outlying districts of the country, although these areas occupied about 80 percent of its territory. The picture has changed radically during the years of Soviet power. Unification of the republics has

made it possible to concentrate all forces and resources and direct them at restoring and further developing the wrecked national economy. The main thing is that the economic and socio-cultural inequality of peoples, inherited from the old system, was basically eliminated in the process of building socialism.

The harmonious combination of national and international interests in the area of management of the economy—a decisive sphere of social life—caused a corresponding development in the spiritual life of all peoples of the multinational Soviet society. It is hard for the current generation of people to imagine that 60 years ago total illiteracy reigned in their country, and more than 40 nationalities did not even have a written language. But now, in addition to the broad network of general education schools implementing a program of universal secondary education, the country has about 1,000 VUZes and 4,200 technical schools. All union republics have their own academy of sciences with dozens of scientific research institutions, in which thousands of highly qualified scientists representing the native nationalities work.

The literature and art of all peoples of the Soviet Union have achieved unprecedented growth. Tens of thousands of theaters, clubs, palaces, libraries and other centers of culture serve the multinational people.

[Question] Today, during the period of restructuring and democratization of our society, flagrant mistakes and "irregularities" committed in relations between nations have been identified, and in a number of cases a departure from the Leninist principles of national policy.

[Answer] The objective analysis of the real achievements and the current state of relations between nations, given at the 27th CPSU Congress in M.S. Gorbachev's report on the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and in the decisions of recent CPSU Central Committee plenums, has shown that serious violations were committed in implementing national policy during the period of the cult of personality, stagnation and conservatism. Specifically, they were reflected in the fact that the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the need for thorough consideration of the historical, political, legal, cultural, ethnic, socio-psychological and other factors in organizing the management of relations between nations in a multinational state was buried in oblivion. What is more, administrative and territorial boundaries between certain republics were voluntaristically changed; union republics and autonomous oblasts were created separately, although representatives of the same nationality lived in them and their territories were contiguous. The reactionist principle of "divide and conquer," well-known to history, again revealed itself in the Stalinist practice. The Stalinist repressions embraced not only millions of innocent people and their families, but also

entire peoples. Meanwhile, the complete resolution of the nationalities question and all problems of relations between nations was proclaimed as the indisputable truth.

Let us take, for example, the question of Nagornyy Karabakh and the events surrounding it, on which the attention of the Soviet people is riveted with a feeling of deep alarm and optimistic expectations. Reliable historical documents indicate that after the establishment of Soviet power in Azerbaijan (April 1920) and Armenia (November 1920), the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan passed a declaration which proclaimed: "Nagornyy Karabakh, Zangezur and Nakhichevan are recognized as a constituent part of the Armenian Socialist Republic." V.I. Lenin welcomed this most important act of internationalism. Both local newspapers and PRAVDA (4 December 1988) wrote about this during those days. However, as a result of Stalin's voluntaristic interference later, resolution of this issue was reconsidered and frozen for years.

Beginning in the 1920's, the Armenian population of Nagornyy Karabakh repeatedly turned to the union authorities with a request for unification with Soviet Armenia. But only under conditions of the revolutionary perestroika has a real formulation of this question become possible. The lesson of PRAVDA, given by the 27th CPSU Congress and developed in decisions of subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, has led the party to conclude that there are a multitude of problems unresolved or resolved not in accord with the ideals of socialism. "We are rehabilitating PRAVDA," the editorial 'Principles of Perestroika: Revolutionary Nature of Thought and Action' states, "purging it of counterfeit and cunning truths which led to the dead-end street of social apathy..." The development of democracy and glasnost, as the chief requirement of perestroika, has given the peoples and nations of our multi-national country an opportunity to get out of the dead-end street of social apathy and think through their unresolved problems from a position of social active ness. In Nagornyy Karabakh, the people spoke of this in complete accord with the requirements of perestroika, socialist democracy and glasnost. As was already noted in the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on Nagornyy Karabakh, for years the socio-economic and spiritual interests of the people here have been infringed upon, their sense of national dignity has been humiliated, and steps have not been taken to prevent outrages and violence. It is clear that under such conditions the people cannot help but hope for a just resolution of the question of their fate.

**[Question] In your view, what are the ways of developing and strengthening relations between nations and improving the union of Soviet peoples?**

The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Conference note the need for a democratic resolution of questions of national policy in accordance

with the Leninist principle of combining international and national interests. "Within the framework of perestroika," it is stated, "urgent steps should be considered and taken for further development of the Soviet federation." Every literate person should know that an inalienable problem of developing the Soviet federation is the further improvement of state system and the status of union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and other forms of national statehood.

Obviously, these questions will be the subject of comprehensive discussion at the upcoming party conference and at the CPSU Central Committee Special Plenum on questions of national policy.

In the area of further improving the Soviet federation, more concrete definition of the constitutional status of union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts and okrugs, their rights and the principles of mutual relations between them are of paramount importance. It is advisable to grant all autonomous republics the status of an independent subject of the Soviet Socialist Federation. Apparently, there is an imminent need to change a number of autonomous republics into union republics, and autonomous oblasts into autonomous republics.

More than 100 nations and nationalities live in the Soviet Union, but there are only 53 various forms of national statehood. It seems that based on consideration of the principle of right to self-determination, they should be granted a specific form of autonomy up to and including a national rayon, village and rural soviet. As V.I. Lenin noted, conditions must be created in the Soviet federation which assume the "most complete freedom of various localities and even various communities in developing diverse forms of state, social, as well as economic life."

In the process of comprehensive development of democracy, as the chief condition of successful accomplishment of the multipronged tasks of the perestroika strategy, there is an imminent need to expand the rights of union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts and okrugs so they are given the actual possibility of sovereign resolution of the question of their own vital activities.

National and territorial problems should be resolved immediately and radically on a consistently democratic basis, taking into account the will of the national minority located in a given republic. In fact, the founders of Marxism-Leninism noted that each nation must be his own master, and the right to self-determination means that this question should be resolved not by a central parliament but by the parliament, by the Sejm, and by referendum of the national minority which is separated.

Based on this, we should reexamine the provision of the USSR Constitution according to which an autonomous oblast cannot leave a union republic without the consent

of its Supreme Soviet. It is necessary to make changes to the boundaries between certain union republics so as to reunite the population of the same nationality living side by side.

Of great importance in the matter of further democratic development of the Soviet multinational state is the provision of the CPSU Central Committee Theses which notes "the need to activate the institutions by means of which national interests must be identified and reconciled.

In this regard, we share the opinion on fundamentally reexamining and expanding the function of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which today actually duplicates the activities of the Council of the Union. The direct purpose of the Council of Nationalities is to resolve fundamental problems of relations between nations occurring between union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts and other nation-state formations.

In a multinational socialist country, it is advisable to create a supreme constitutional arbitration body which must develop proposals for all international disputes which arise and submit them to the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet or to the union government.

All nations and nationalities should be proportionally represented in all all-union leadership and management bodies, as required by V.I. Lenin.

Of course, it is also necessary to consolidate constitutionally legal and political guarantees ensuring absolute observance of all democratic principles of the Soviet federation, which are the basis of harmonious combination of international and international interests.

I do not think there is a need to prove that during the period of perestroika a chief condition and basic guarantee of implementing a socially just policy in international relations is the complete restoration and strict observance of the Leninist program on the question of nationalities. To this end, it is necessary, first of all, to correct the significant violations of its requirements committed as a result of Stalinist voluntarism and usurpation, which led to a certain deformation of international relations. It is clear that the strategic course being pursued by the part of fundamental restructuring of all spheres of life of the Soviet society and overcoming the deformations of socialism also encompasses the sphere of national policy and complete restoration of the Leninist principles of harmonious combination of international and national interests.

12567

**END OF  
FICHE  
DATE FILMED**

12 Sept, 1988

